

THE GREAT GORGON

OF THE

SCHIFFER

OF

THE GREAT GORGON

THE GREAT GORGON

THE GREAT GORGON

YALE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

CHICAGO, ILL.

1917

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

MS. A. 9.2

To His Highness OLIVER, Lord Protector
of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and
Ireland, and the Dominions thereunto belonging.

May it please Your Highness,



That I should commend a Cavalier to You, may, at this time, seem an incongruous address, considering how much You have suffered from *some* of that party: But then, if those I present be none of that *some*, but such as are *neither guilty of Schism nor Sedition*, nor (being *true to their principles*) can be so; it will then, I hope, not be taken as presumption, so much as duty, to commend such Servants to the protection of so good a Master. So that now, *Sir*, having drawn You into a concern in that Party, I shall be a little more free on their behalf.

Sir, It is to all the world apparent, that there is no Party that by their Principles stand more inclined and affected to the present Government, that is, to Monarchy, than they: For they fought for their then Monarch, even for Monarchy sake; not for him as he was *Charles Stuart*, but as that their *Sovereign Lord the King*, which by the *grace of God* had the present dominion over them. Nay, *Sir*, in that, we did not only shew good affection to this present Government, but to You our present Governor; yes, and fought for You too, and that when You fought against Your self. For, *Sir*, it cannot be denied, but that as You are more eminently Your self now than before, as being *by the grace of God* advanced to that power You had not then; so also, in fighting for him, who was by relation our then present Protector, we did fight for You your self, our present Protector now.

But it may be objected, that there are some that have conceived personal prejudice against You. It is too plain there are so; but these are not the men I plead for, nor are they such as (by the most considerable men amongst us) are owned as true Royalists or Cavaliers. No, *Sir*, they are by them looked upon as their greatest enemies, even because, by their undutiful and disloyal attempts, they have given You occasion to suspect the whole party. *Sir*, our Principle is to respect him that is our

Higher Power as in conscience sake to the ordinance of God, and not out of any fancy sake to his person alone, as the ordinance of man. And yet, Sir, in respect of your personal worth too, and of that affection and esteem the most of us have of you, I will speak it knowingly, that were it in our own choice, we should rather have you then any other in the three Nations to be our Sovereign. And as for any hardship under which we do for the present lie, and whe ein violation may seem to be offered to the *Act of Oblivion*, we do (as I said) impute the occasion to those that have wrongfully assumed the name of the Royal party. It is not (I assure You) taken as proceeding from Your self, who are looked upon as the chief Author of that Act, as *David* was of that Covenant made with *Abner*, for reducing all *Israel* (such as had formerly taken part with the house of *Saul*) under one obedience. But as *all the people and all Israel understood then that it was not of the King*, so are they perswaded of You now. We consider, that as *David* had such as *Shimei* and *Sheba*, that out of personal relation to others did disturb him, so also had he sons of *Zeruah*, such as were too hard for him, *although in the Throne*: He had such as *Joab*, who out of emulation to be outstript in service or fidelity, or out of secret grudge or anger at the loss of a Brother, or the like, received in the time of war, would perswade that *Abner*, and such as he, came but to deceive him, and to be as Spies to him in the behalf of some other. In which their dealing towards such as were their brethren and of the same Nation and Religion with themselves, they shewed not so much conscience and good nature, as is recorded *2 Chron. 28. 9, &c.* to have been used towards those that had been overcome by war then.

But, Sir, we look upon You as as our Joint-Protector now; and our prayer shall be to Him that *bath the hearts of Princes in His hand, and can turn them which way soever He pleaseth*, That no Council may prevail with You, but what may be for the Glory of GOD, and the general Peace and good of these Nations: In which Your royal resolution; I hope You shall never fail of the ready assistance of those that are of the Royal party; nor, I am sure, of the prayers and endeavours of

Your HIGHNESS most humble
and loyal Subject,
JOHN HALL.

P R E F A C E.

IT was to me an unhappy diversion, when the Civil distractions of my Country about matter of Government and Obedience, had bereft me of that Imployment wherein before my livelihood did consist, and only furnished me with a melancholy leisure to reflect upon the true grounds and justice of quarrels of like nature. Which being at first done for my own satisfaction only, during the time of that contention, came afterwards to such bulk, as that by the advice of some that were well-willers to Peace, I was perswaded to send it abroad into the World for the satisfaction of others, in way of prevention of what might happen in like case for the future.

But then again, proposing to my self to become as effectual herein as I could, and considering how prone such as had been of the contrary party and opposite to Monarchy, might be to object partiality to me in reference to that relation I bore to the late King and the Court, I was the more wary not to let any thing slip that might seem to have personal respect: But as I had from Scripture and Reason found Monarchy to be the best and only right form of Government, so to let them see that it was not for any one Monarchs sake I did it; but out of a desire to maintain perpetual peace and unity amongst us, I asserted this obedience to be continually due to that Person which God in his providence should set over us. And truly I have looked upon submission and conformity to the present Power, not only as necessary in respect of duty and care of publick peace and benefit, but for advance of private wishes too, be they on which side they will: Not only fittest to be given to him that by Divine appointment is to be settled in this power, but also to be given in case he should be removed; for that the sooner that work is done, and he brought to that height which God hath decreed, the sooner shall he be taken away, and some other put in his place.

That

PREFACE.

That which I then did to avoid imputation of partiality, hath been by some on the other side conceived as an Apostacie from the true Principles of the Royalist, and as favouring both of ingratitude to the last, and of flattery to him that is now in power. Upon which account they have also condemned whatsoever is by me done in conformity to any present Establishment in the outward profession of Religion; as not deeming what was before settled in that kind by the former Higher Power, can be legally abrogated by this. In answer to all which I shall desire it may be considered, that I undertake not to write as a Servant, but as a Subject, and of the duty of subjection and obedience as indefinitely put, and abstracted from all personal regard. It was not the scope of my intention to compare person with person, or to shew which of them I was most obliged unto, or would for my own part have chosen either for my Prince or Master; but to set forth that duty which became me and all men else, as considered in the common relation of Subjects: which being impartially done, I doubt not but it will to others, as it hath done to my self, appear, that (in order to the manifestation of Gods glory) all the means for mans preservation ought to be endeavoured; that mans preservation, peace and charity having a necessary dependance on submission to the authority of some one, that shall be in all causes and over all persons as well Ecclesiastical as Civil, next under Christ supreme Head and Governor; it could not but follow, that he only was to be obeyed in things of this nature. And that the means to Peace, Unity and Charity may at no time be wanting, I have determined obedience to be given to him that shall be from time to time possessed of this high place of Supremacie and power. And these things I have made the Arguments of the three Chapters of this Treatise. The first to shew the true rise and scope of Religion; the next to shew what the notion of Church doth import, and of the power of him that shall be Head thereof; and lastly, to shew that no imputation of defect of Title can take off our duty of subjection. All which being cleared, I presume that those censures which passed on me and others for hearing or receiving where Common-Prayer or other Ceremonies were not used, or for hearing of such as (I might suspect at least) were not ordained as heretofore, and the like, would be found to be grounded more on prejudice than reason.

In

P R E F A C E.

In the first larger Book of Government and Obedience, having (as I said) an especial aim to the satisfaction of such as were neither convinced in the right of Kingly government, nor of that fulness of power that belonged thereunto; I made use of no authority in proof of what I said, save that of Scripture and Reason; both because these were not only the best and true authorities, as also for that (generally) with them all humane authority was not regarded. But now being put to question what are the true Principles of the Cavalier or Royalist, to the end it may be known whether I, in my conformity, or others, in their recusancie, have best followed them; it must be expected I should quote some of the most Reverenced and Orthodox Authorities in our Church that have treated of things of this nature. And if in any thing in this Treatise I shall be conceived short of the proof intended, recourse may be had to the former Volume, where most of the same questions are more largely handled; unto which this was intended as a supplement in some part only.

And for fear any should mistake or conclude me disrespectful to the Service-book or former Ceremonies, because I am now perswading to conformity in alteration; I shall in this case also desire them to consider, that I am not now taking upon me the part of a Judge or Law-maker, and comparing those Forms and Rights with any other of like kind, so as to estimate which were best and most convenient to be received as to separate Worth in themselves; but writing now as a Son or Member of a Church, in things determined by her authority already, the case will be found much different.

As I am not so partial to my self, as not to conceive my own insufficiencie may be a cause why in many particulars my Proofs and Reasons are no more satisfactory and convincing: So, on the other side again, being to write in defence of Authority, and to perswade to Obedience, I must expect that both my self and work shall be vulgarly entertained with a Censure suitable to what Mr. Hooke armed himself against, when he wrote against the Non-conformists of his time, viz. He that goeth about to perswade a multitude, that they are not so well governed as they ought to be, shall never want attentive and favorable hearers, because they know the manifold defects whereunto every kind of Regiment

P R E F A C E.

ment is subject; but the secret lets and difficulties, which in publique proceedings are incumberable and inevitable, they have not ordinarily the judgment to consider. And because such as openly reprove supposed disorders of State, are taken for principal friends to the common benefit of all, and for men that carry singular freedom of mind; under this fair and plausible colour, whatsoever they utter passeth for good and current: That which wanteth in the weight of their speech, is supplied by the aptness of mens minds to accept and believe it. Whereas on the other side, if we maintain things that are established, we have not only to strive with a number of heavy prejudices deeply rooted in the hearts of men, who think that herein we serve the time, and speak in favor of the present State, because thereby we either hold or seek preferment; but also to bear with such except ons as minds so averted beforehand usually take against that which they are loth should be poured into them.

The grounds of prejudice and aversion are (I must confess) naturally strong and pressing, especially when they come to that height (as mine did) to be thereby deprived of all. But when we shall have laid that passion aside which might arise from the thoughts of our former condition, and consulted with Reason, of what in conscience and prudence is fittest to be resolved on in the condition we now stand, I doubt not but those Motives that have prevailed with me, will prevail with others also, that the remainder of our life may be led with more comfort. Upon which hope I have thus exposed my self to publick view; as mindful of that admonition of our Saviour to S. Peter; And thou being converted, strengthen thy brethren. Which God Almighty grant.

CHAP.



CHAP. I.

Of Religion in its true ground and foundation.

THings that have life, are essentially distinguished from those that want, by particular sensation of their own perfections and enjoyments. And as they are again specifically distinguished and differenced from one another by degree of perfection and beatitude, so also by degree of vigor and relish in fruition. For as it is an abatement to happiness to have sense of loss or pain intermixed; so is it also an increase thereunto, to be perceptible thereof in the highest degree of satisfaction and assurance. In which regard, since evidence of completeness and fruition must be increased through increase of extension and emanation issuing from it self, and that again increased through increase of those objects whereon it worketh (whereby as the Print from the Seal, the party possessed may find it self in degree more fully and powerfully therewith endued :) It must therefore come to pass, that as it is most natural in God to be in the highest measure perfect and happy, so also to be communicative or good, and in goodness again to be enlarged and apparent.

B

For

For to be blessed or happy, as to self-respect alone, argues not so plainly an immensity in any thing as to be extensive herein to others, without other confinement save that of its own good pleasure. That incomprehensible degree of wisdom and power which in the beginning of time did manifest it self in the whole Creation, took effect from that innate propension to beneficence, which before all time was in the Creator himself: Omnipotence serving as the means to accomplish that which Goodness had first designed as its end.

1. Consequent to the work of Creation is that of Providence: For as it was a work proper to the prime Goodness to make things perfect and happy, so likewise to preserve them so. In which respect (again) it must farther fall out, that as evidence of possession and perfection was increased from the signature thereof upon other things, even so also, for farther manifestation of the worth and force of the energie and impression (as to goodness and bounty) it was onwards necessary, that according to those degrees of blessings and benefits received, there should be in the Receiver a higher measure of resentment implanted, the which we usually comprehend under the name of Pleasure. For, these things which of meer grace and mercy do from divine bounty fall on any Sensitive, when they come to be received by that Sensitive as beneficial and good, cannot naturally be otherwise attested then by and under that conception; Pleasure it self being no otherwise evil or forbidden, then as depriving us of some more large and lasting delight.

2. Which pleasure again, as it is by each sensitive pursued as its end, by the wise dispensation of the Creator it is so ordered, that it should be not only in the highest degree communicated to things which are of greatest perfection, but also to such actions of theirs most eminently annexed, as do withal tend to the preservation and benefit of their own particulars, or that of their race and species. And therefore since some things stood more participant
and

and sensible of the beatitude, perfection, and image of their Maker (by means of life, understanding, and will ;) it will farther follow, that in reference to the more full expression of his own glory and goodness, a more exact and greater measure of providence and express rules should be set down and added for their preservation, then of things of inferior regard. That Law of Nature, and those instincts and properties wherewith Inanimates or other sensitives do stand guided, seemed not sufficient for the conduct of man ; who being in a higher degree participant and sensible of divine resemblance and goodness, stood not only in himself, like them, positively expressing Gods bounty in his own receipts, but, beyond them, by means of his reason and intellect, able to acknowledg even those benefits which himself or others had received, and so become a more express witness of his Makers favor and glory.

3. From hence it comes to pass that men, like other sensitives, are not only naturally led by sense of pleasure to the prosecution of those things that tend to specifical or particular preservation, (in order to the accomplishment of his will, that ordains his bounty to be extended as well to the individuals that for the present are, as to the successive generations of them to be by this means brought forth and made participants thereof) but also by another Law proper to themselves, even the Law of Reason, can apprehend and acquire that which is in a fuller degree fit for themselves also to execute, either for their own avail, or that of others. And therefore when again we find, that there is in all things naturally implanted a certain degree of love and delight unto those things unto which they are most usually associated and conversant ; even so we find Mankind not only, like them, won to love and liking of one another by means of society, but by discourse and reason, being in degree made sensible of the benefit and pleasure which other things receive by means of the expression of this his love towards them, and also of his duty in doing, he is by sense of honor as well naturally and politically enforced, as by

encouragement from above strengthened and directed in this resolution.

4. The passed discourse being summed up, and examined towards the discovery of mans duty, will easily discover that juncture and coincidence that is between the Precepts of the First and Second Table. We may find why God that cannot, as in any proper regard, be any ways steaded or served by us, doth yet reckon of our services to one another as a service to himself; according to that saying of David, *My goodness extendeth not to thee, but to the Saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent*, Ps. 16. 2, 3: Or that of Job, *Can a man be profitable unto God, as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself?* Job 22. 2. And again, *If thou sinnest, what dost thou against him?* ch. 35. 6. *Or if thou be righteous, what givest thou him? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art, and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.*

All which would be well considered of by such as, in a mistaken or misgrounded zeal to Gods honor, Gods service, Gods glory, Gods worship (as they use to phrase it, and to be performed in such a measure and manner as they are perswaded is best and truest) are ready to make him apparently to act against himself, and will themselves be his Agents even to kill men under colour of doing him good service. These men are to consider, that if Gods honor or glory had, under the Gospel, been tied to any such precise outward form of Worship, it had been easie with him at first, and easie every day it still is, to make such exact declaration of his will therein, that none can make doubt or scruple thereof; as amongst the Jews he did. But he now requiring chiefly the devotion of our hearts, and leaving all things disputable, in the measure and manner of any outward Form, to those that have the rule over us, we do then dis-serve him, when we break Charity and Order, and make a Schism in our service to him.

And since God doth not only take care for mans Being, (which is politically included under the notion of Peace) but
of.

of his Well-being also (which we may comprise under the term of *Plenty*) to the end that through the sense and pleasure of his enjoyments he may be stirred up to praise and acknowledg him; it is therefore farther to be considered, that even in those duties that are apparently to be performed towards God, as being expressely commanded for perpetuity in Scripture, as duties of the first Table, there be not yet so violent a pressure made, or yoke laid on the back of flesh and blood, as to defeat the end of the second Table, Mans good, and make his service seem altogether a burthen. And therefore they that are so ready to fancie to themselves an eminent proficiencie in piety, out of the more strict observation of some one or two Precepts, as the Pharisees of old were wont to do in the strict observation of the Sabbath, even to the neglect of the rest, are to remember our Saviors answer to the same Pharisees, *That the Sabbath was made for man, not man for it.* For as the sense of pleasure and enjoyment was implanted as well to witness Gods bounty, as to provoke us to gratitude; therefore unnecessarily to abate mans pleasure, is to abate Gods glory: Which should have been considered of them that, for fear of breaking the Sabbath-day, would now turn it into a day of fasting and mourning. They are to remember how that Evangelical Prophet *Isaiab*, Chap. i. is declaiming against those things that were done in more direct service to God, as *Sacrifice, Prayers*, and the like, and directs them to the observance of those things that tended to Charity, as a more ready way to serve and please him; *To abstain from blood, to seek judgment, to relieve the oppressed, the fatherless, the widow, and the like.* They are to consider, that although God doth set down his own service first, and strictly call for our faith and fear towards him, (as well knowing that according to our fear and confidence in him, our observance of his laws will follow) yet doth he always aim at our good, to be gained or strengthened by any religious observance. In which regard we may well know how to interpret that speech of *St. Paul*, *He that*
provideth

provideth not for his family hath denied the faith, and is worse then an Infidel. Where in an Oeconomical instance he speaketh of that force which Christian Religion, upon its true ground and intent, should have in the promoting of all moral vertues besides: Insomuch as not to do the one, is to deny the other, and to become worse then he that hath no faith in Christ at all, because he wanted that divine direction and encouragement thereunto.

And lastly, for want of due consideration of these things, and how *Charity is the end of the Law*, it is, that men are generally so superstitious, and so disconsolate and unsatisfied in their religious performances; even so as to become *Quakers*, *Seekers*, and what not? For while they guide themselves in their actions, without due sense or regard how these things are both of them, by Rules of Religion made mutually serviceable to the same end, they do lose their Religion by this irregular and partial seeking of it in one sort only; even by dissolving and disjoining those things which God hath thereby joined together. For as all Vertue and Morality (in regard of our inability to be so fully compleat as the first strict Rule of Providence requires) is no better then Heathenish Philosophy, when done without faith in Christ, or sense of duty towards God; so also all acts of devotion proceeding from any uncharitable heart, or not having charitable intention, but done only out of fear or care to please or serve God thereby, as in things by him aimed at for himself, are at best but superstition. And therefore when our Saviour makes up our Religion by joining these fundamental precepts, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thy self*: And when again it is said, *Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord*: It is not for us to think of disjoining that religious tie of the Word, and to believe that by any extraordinary way of serving God whom we see not, or of following of some holy duties, we can find acceptance, if we have not (the while) a due regard to the love of our Brother whom we do see, and

and to follow Peace also. But since *Righteousness and Peace have thus kissed each other*, Men should therefore in their religious deportments seek to *preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace*, and even *study to be quiet*, by making conscience of avoidance of such things whereby scandal may be given or taken, to the disturbance of their joint Communion in the same Profession. Let men be to their utmost wary in communicating in acts of known sin, because nothing of that kind but tendeth to the dishonor of God, and the general harm of men: But let them with all take heed that private prejudice, interest or passion makes them not forsake their society as they are men, much less in what they do as Christians; for that were more directly both to dishonor God as Creator and Redeemer, and to prejudice man himself: For although we may and must hate and abandon *vice and sin*, yet we may not the *virious and sinner* farther then they are so; but *so far as is possible, and as much as in us lieth, to have peace with all men*.

7. If we look to Mankind in their first way of Religion, and to that condition and ability they then stood in, for maintenance of their duty both towards God and their neighbor; we shall find that in all these deviations or defects wherein, through private appetite and abundance of enjoyment, they might be led both to forget the Author of their benefits, and to neglect the good and preservation of other things, their fellow-creatures, that God almighty did accept of them and what they did, while they should forbear to eat of that forbidden Tree of the *Knowledge of good and evil*; Sacramentally put to repute them as innocent in all such actions, as in a strict sense they might be found to deviate from the fulfilling of the whole Law or Rule of Providence, since they implicitly obeyed him that was the Author thereof, and took not upon them to be guided by their own knowledge of that good and evil whereto they might morally tend.

8. In the second estate, and under the Law, we may apprehend

apprehend God conditioning with the posterity of him that had been most righteous in the keeping of the first Natural Law, for the observation of a certain number of Precepts; upon the performance whereof there was a promise of Justification, as if they had performed the whole Moral Law, or Law of Providence.

9. But this being yet found too difficult, God almighty, in the third way of dispensation of his will, to wit, in the Evangelical Covenant, conditions with Mankind for Belief; not accepting us for any acts of our own, as our own, but as done and accepted in the name and by the merit of another; whom, by faith, we are now to apprehend and rely upon, as having in himself fulfilled all we stood outwardly bound unto, as well in reference to the first large Law of Providence, as to the Jewish abridgment thereof.

10. In the first Covenant it was, *Forbear this and live*; in the second, the Condition was, *Do this and live*; in the third, *Believe this and live*.

11. If we shall compare these Covenants one to another, we shall find the greatest similitude and agreement between the first and the last; between our state and condition under the first, and under the second *Adam*. For as under the first, we had but one Precept to observe as immediately divine, so under the second also. Then, whereas we stood innocent in our deportments while guided inwardly by the propensions of uncorrupted Nature; and in what we might thwart one another, stood obedient to our natural fathers: So here, are we innocent too, while inwardly guided by Nature rectified by Grace, being all taught of God to love one another: And for our outward deportments, both in Godliness and honesty, submitting to such as have a spiritual fatherhood and rule over us, whose faith we are to follow, considering the end of their conversation, Heb 13.7. even the maintenance of peace and order: And do all things without murmuring and disputing, that we may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, in the midst of a froward and perverse generation, wherein we shine

as lights in the world, Phil. 2: 14. To which end we may observe our Saviour, the second *Adam*, describing the innocencie of the Evangelical estate to consist also in the abnegation of our prying humors, when he answers the Pharisees that would be so much guided by pride and partiality in their interpretations of the written Law, without regard to the main drift of the Law: *If ye were blind, you should have no sin; but now ye say we see, therefore your sin remaineth.*

12. But now, under the Law, all these Precepts being so immediately and strictly given and enjoined by God himself to be for perpetuity, literally observed by all of that Nation and Covenant, no one person could plead exemption from that sentence, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Law to do them*, farther then he could be to himself conscious, that according to his best enquiry he had exactly fulfilled them. Whereas under the Gospel or New-Covenant, we shall find the case clean otherwise; and not as it was formerly made with our fathers, when God took them (as it were) by the hand, to guide them in their actions by Rules delivered by himself, Heb. 8. 9. But now doth it by an inward Law written in our hearts. And therefore S. Paul putting the difference between them, bringeth in the *Righteousness which is by the Law speaking in this wise, The man that doth these things shall live by them; when that righteousness which is of faith, enquireth neither for new literal precepts to be received from Christ now in heaven, or for literal observance of the old Law, the which he fulfilled in his death: But what saith it? The word is nigh us, and every day preached; if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. And then for our conformable outward obedience to Christ as King, as well as confession he is our Lord, we have his own direction to hear such as he shall from time to time delegate, when he saith, He that heareth you heareth me, and the like.*

13. If we search after the quality of these which were from time to time to be in this *sovereign*, and that according to those several states and conditions which man then stood in, in respect of those different Covenants & Dispensations he was under; it is to be considered, that as the will and affections of Mankind stood at first more simple and uncorrupt, and their inward plantation of love more natural and entire, so had they again more immediate directions from God himself to guide them in such things as they might occasionally erre in. The innocencie of that first estate causing him more familiarly to converse with the Patriarchs at first; as by those familiar speeches used to Adam and others, and their ready answer (not betokening strangeness) may easily be presumed.

14. But after the Flood, and towards the promulgation of the Law, whenas Mankind grew worse and worse, he then by degrees withdrew such manifestations, only appearing by Angels, or the like; and resolved that *his Spirit should not* (so immediately) *strive with man* in that kind; but to constitute others, who as his Vicegerents should be obeyed in his stead. He would not take to himself such personal Judgment in the acts of violence, as in the case of Abel; but remit the sentencing of it here to be done in an appointed way, by man himself; *Whoever sheddeth mans blood, by man shall his blood be shed.* In which recess of his we must next suppose, that all things tending to the ends before rehearsed, that is, to the honor and worship of God, or preservation and good of men, are now to be directed and guided by others; excepting only such things as by express Law from himself are to be obeyed and acknowledged as unakerable by any other.

15. If we look unto the way and kinde how this regiment should be steered, in regard of persons, it will be plain he never dispensed with this power to more then one at once in chief; not willing there should be any more Gods in any Kingdom on Earth, then was in Heaven it self. To this end it may be observed, that when-ever
God

God makes a promise to any person of a great increase of race and posterity, he doth withal (as a completing of that blessing) make them a promise of a Monarchical or Kingly government; and that most especially to those people of whom he will make his Church, and by whom he would have himself more eminently served. And therefore, although we may find *Ishmael* and *Esau* recorded blessed with a Catalogue of *Princes*, *Kings*, and *Dukes*, yet having reserved to himself the more direct line of *Abraham*, who should be *as the sand of the sea for multitude*, he doth with the one promise the other, *Gen. 17. 6. I will make Nations of thee, and Kings shall come out of thee.* The like he promiseth to *Sarah*, *v. 16. She shall be a mother of Nations, Kings of people shall be of her.* The like is promised to *Jacob*, *Gen. 35. 11. Kings shall come out of thy loins.* Who again, as the next Father to the Tribes, gives it particularly to *Judah*, as an high blessing to be settled on him, in right of that primogeniture which his elder Brothers had forfeited; namely, That this promised Scepter should not depart from *Judah*, nor a Lawgiver from between his feet, till high noon, *Gen. 49. 10.* In which last Promise, under the notion of *Lawgiver* and of *Scepter* in the singular number, we may well understand the King before mentioned. And however the Propheetick designation of Monarchical government, thus succeed as under the notion of *Kings*, as the adopted Father of each Country, took not place until *Moses*; but that tho so that were the natural Fathers of the Tribes, and had right of Government by primogeniture, continued as *Princes* and *Rulers*: yet then, as he was the first that was so stiled, being *King in Jeshurun*, (even as the succeeding Judges may be so well called, for that in the interregnum it is said there was no King in *Israel*) so shall we find *Moses* again so expressly foretelling that they should have a King, as that they should possess the Land. *Deut. 17. 14. When thou comest into the Land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell*

therein,

therein, and shalt say, *I will set a King over me like all the Nations that are round about me, &c.* It is not said, *If thou shalt say*; no such conditional, but an expresse duty or prophetic: For the conjunction [*and*] here used, [*and shalt possess it, and dwell therein, and shalt say*] makes all of them equally certain; as certain in the blessing of Kingship, as in that of the promised Land it self. Of all which I have formerly at large discoursed, and have briefly here premised, to unprejudice such as are averse to Monarchy, or the acknowledgment of the power of Kings in the Church; and shall now treat of the Church it self, and of its proper cognisance and power, in which we shall have farther occasion to assert this Kingly superintendencie.

CHAP. II.

Of the Church Catholick, and of the power and jurisdiction of each particular Church, and Head thereof.

THe word *Ecclesia*, or *Ἐκκλησία*, which we English Church, doth originally import a *Company called forth*, or men met together upon some special occasion. But the Scripture treating of Religious matters, applies that notion to Meetings made to that end. And therefore that Assembly which *Demetrius* and his *Craftsmen* made, is called by that name. But then farther, because to be called forth, must presuppose some person or persons having power so to do, and also to propound and regulate what shall be disputed of or determined in these Assemblies; in that respect again we after find, that those things which in the former unruly meeting could not be composed, are by the *Town-Clark* promised to be determined in a more lawful Church or assembly, to be called according to Authority. All Religions agreeing in this truth, that without observation of Government and Order, both Church and State will quickly run into confusion.

After Christianity had a while been professed, this name by way of excellence was appropriate to them, and those of their communion: Insomuch as in the beginning thereof,
and

and while the Land of *Jewry* did contain the whole number of Believers, or that the Christians there or elsewhere had not cast themselves into any proper or distinct forms of regiment; all such as stood as well separated from the world, as associated amongst themselves by their joint profession of the same faith, stood only distinct from the rest of the world by the word *Church*, or *Church of Christ*, Catholically applied, without distinction thereof into parts in respect of any local application. But when afterwards they came to be dispersed into several Cities, so distant from one another in place, and so different in jurisdictions, as to require some form of Ecclesiastical discipline to be settled amongst themselves for their more orderly service in their Religion; it came then to pass, that as those that had *begotten them in the faith*, and been their spiritual fathers and instructors, had chief authority herein, so were those their Churches and followers distinguished by topical additions, as the *Church* or *Saints* at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, at *Ephesus*, or the like. By the use of the word *at* such a place, and not saying, the *Church of Rome*, of *Corinth*, of *Ephesus*, or the like, (as now we do the *Church of Rome*, *England*, *Geneva*, &c) we are to conceive, that as the first Believers were, in respect of this separation from the rest of the world, in faith and some religious exercises, called by the name of a Church; so these, in those several Cities wherein they lived, were called *Saints* or *Church at* such a City, and not *of*; as betokening that they were as well but a part of that City as to civil regiment, as also a part of the whole Catholick Church now subordinate to some separate Authority in the exercise of their Religion. But then we are to conceive, that although this separation of theirs from others of the same City, both in their meetings and holy exercises, were done in order to their Religion; yet was it not the quality of any Religion, as such a Religion, but difference in rites and form of Worship, and in meeting thereabouts from that other Religion which was publicly authorised in that place, which made it preserve this name of *Church* as taken in its proper sense.

And

And therefore (as before said) we shall usually find that the Addition of the *Church of God*, or of *Christ*, is put to distinguish, as well as to dignifie it above other religious Congregations that were not such. And upon this reason it is, that we never read in the Scripture, that the the word *Church* is applied to the *Jews*, although they were a Nation separate from all the rest of the world, both in their Religion it self, and in the Ceremonies thereof; even for that it was all one and the same with that which the publick Authority of that place did appoint and allow. Whereas when Christianity first began amongst them, the first Professors thereof, being but subordinately divided, were set down as a Church or Congregation of men in that respect separate, saying, *The Church*, or *Church of Christ which is at Jerusalem*.

Which being considered, we need not wonder why *S. Paul*, should proceed to no higher punishment then that of Excommunication, against a *Blasphemer*, or an *incestuous person*, or the like, who (by the very heinousness and nature of their sins) might be presumed not greatly desirous of their Communion; even for that it was, at that time, all the punishment he, or other Heads of Churches could inflict, wanting (as before noted) all coercive jurisdiction. Upon which ground again, we find not that the *Jews* did ever exercise this kind of punishment while they continued masters of their own sovereignty; but, comprising all offences under the same Law, they punished transgressions of all sorts as breaches thereof: when yet afterward in the time of our Saviour, that the supreme power was in the hand of the *Romans*, we find them both threatening, and actually thrusting men out of their Synagogues.

But however such notorious sinners as those might, in the infancie of Christianity, set lightly of any Church-censure in that kind; yet with the more conscientious sort, who, in regard of those many promises by Christ made to his Church, had been at first won to be of their fellowship and communion as the only means to their salvation, it

was

was taken as a punishment of the highest import. And however that the then Church, for want of Judiciary power as aforesaid, could not punish otherwise, yet since it became all that were named by the name of Christ to depart from iniquity, and to have their conversation such as became Saints, and to walk worthy that vocation wherewith they were called, (in which respect we shall find the name of Disciples, Believers, Saints, Church, and Christians, indifferently used to signify those that made profession of Christs name) It therefore became them who were to be as lights on a hill, and to see that others light did so shine before men, that they seeing their good works might glorifie that God in whose obedience they did it, to be very sensible and tender of permitting any thing scandalous in the eye of the world, to be acted or countenanced by any of their profession.

In reference to which gracious promises of Salvation, Illumination, Assistance, and the like, made by Christ to his Church, and of that degree of sanctity wherewith those of this profession stood eminent above the rest of the world, or of that City or place where they lived; it is no wonder if we find that this notion of Church was still used, even after the time that the publick Authority of the Country came also to be of the same belief; especially considering that it was more then three hundred years after Christs birth before any Emperor at all was of that profession, from which they quickly again fell; and that during the said time, and a good while after, the more considerable, and perhaps the major part of the Empire it self, (besides what was done in other Countries more heathenish) continued still Infidels. Towards whose conversion, and for the greater honor of their Master and his doctrine, as they desired to become worthy Disciples by the example of their holy lives, so d d they withall still keep up as far as might be a communion with one another therein, as well as a separation from others that were not of the same belief. But yet we shall never find in Scripture, or Author of antiquity,

tiquity, that was not prejudiced by particular adherence to some party, that these notions of *Church* or *Saints* were used to separate Christians from Christians, so as to account others (especially their fellow-subjects) that publicly professed faith and obedience to Christ, to be yet none of his Church; until such time as the whole Church, through the goodness of God, being rid of the fear of much harm from such as for Christs sake were their common enemy, some separate parts thereof began in a strange requital to seek out enemies amongst themselves: Ambition, pride, interest, and passion causing men to forget those prime precepts of *humility, meekness, patience, brotherly love*, and the like, wherewith Christianity stood at first adorned, and whereby they (as out of a common principle of love to Christ and his honor, as well as to one another, according to the true intent of Religion) were piously and unanimously guided; and now to prosecute that course which should at once hazard the honor and good of both Christ and his whole Church, through their strife to advance some particular Sect above the rest, and themselves in it. As if Christs Disciples and followers must not now be called such in regard of their faith in him, as formerly was used; but out of belief in, and for following them rather in things circumstantial, or by themselves called fundamental, the more to countenance that breach of Charity which must thence ensue: hereby shewing that we have not, *as the true elect of God and beloved, put on bowels of mercies, kindnesses, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering; so as to forbear one another, and forgive one another, if any man have a quarrel against any, even as Christ forgave us: But have neglected to put on Charity, which is the bond of perfectness; and so let the peace of God rule in our hearts, to the which we are also called into one body, even this body and communion of a Church, Col. 3. 12, &c.* It being indeed impossible for any but such elect as these to escape those *deceits and snares* which each particular Sect, *as in Christs name*, will be ready to lay before us, saying, *Lo here is Christ,*

Christ, and to there is Christ ! on purpose to affright us from confidence in that Name whereby alone under heaven we can be saved ; as if salvation were not to be found in being a Member of the Catholick Church, or any part of it, as Christian ; but in that secret Chamber, or that desert Assembly, which is now separately named and owned by themselves.

6. This is that great misery under which Christendom hath of late been so much troubled, as well through that ambitious humor of universal rule and dominion, whereby those of the Roman party (out of opinion of Eminencie, Succession, or the like) would advance their Head to be Head of the whole Church, (even where his jurisdiction reacheth not :) As of others also, who, in any particular Church, are ready to make a separation of themselves ; as though, in regard of any extraordinary degree of sincerity, of worship, or sanctity of life by them professed above others, the antient notion of *Church* could now again be appropriate to them, without notice of their Brethren of the same Religion, and those in Authority, and perhaps more in number also ; in like manner as formerly the notion of *Church* was understood in opposition to those that were meer Heathens.

7. The truth is, that Christian societies may well be distinguished from Professors of other Religions by this peculiar appellation ; their Religion being indeed *the* Religion, even as their God is apparently *the* God. For where they, in discovery of their meer humane extraction or wor^{sh}ip, are, in their precepts, wholly regardful of their own outward glory, pomp and estimation, and that according to humane fancie and opinion ; when we are by voice from heaven taught that strict conjunction which is between *Glory to God in the highest ! and Peace on earth, and good will towards men.* Their Deities stand manifestly on their Sacrifices, professing greatest love to such as are most zealous in them, or such like kind of adoration : Ours pronounce *Charity the end of the Law, and prefer Mercy before Sacri-*

five; and, to encourage men thereto, our Saviour personateth the *hungry, blind, naked, imprisoned*, and promiseth even the reward of Heaven to such as should most express their love and duty to him that way:

8. And thereupon again, as true it is, that particular Churches cannot seclude one another from being members of that Catholick body, while they acknowledged the same Common head; much less can such as live within the authority, or are members of any Christian Church or society, claim any jurisdiction apart, or make separation therefrom, upon allegation of any extraordinary sanctity or neerer degree of imploiment in Religious affairs; for this were to overthrow the main scope of the Church before set down. And therefore since humane preservation and Peace is the end of Religious as well as Civil associations, it will therefore follow, that as each State hath its rule entire and absolute, for the better preservation of concord and order, so must each Christian State or Church much more have the like, in as much as those precepts and directions leading thereunto are much more apparently within their Commission; their duty and charge being to perfect and consummate that by a religious tie, unto which natural perfection could not reach.

9. And hereby it comes to pass, that what was vertue or vice in a bare Philosophical accompt, is now called righteousness or sin. And so these Politick societies, which; upon the former light of natural reason, took upon them the guidance of humane actions, and were called Kingdoms and Commonwealths, when they come to acknowledg subjection to this higher direction and rule, are usually called Churches also. And thereupon those that were formerly called Schismatics in respect of separation, or stubbornness to Ecclesiastick authority, are now to be esteemed seditious and Rebels also, if they do in any such thing disobey or oppose him that hath both these authorities conjoined. For very hard it would seem, if the same terms of separation should still be kept up against Christian Princes
and

and Rulers, as was formerly; and they allowed no more honor and power being Christians, then while they were Pagans. But we will now proceed to shew what hath been the sense of the Church of *England* herein, according to the doctrine of those that were eminent in it.

10. As those of the Roman party had (no doubt) a design of stretching the Papal jurisdiction, even in temporals, by their engrossment of all spiritual power as Catholick head, so hath it been always censured by ours as an unjust usurpation: Therefore we shall find that the late *Archbishop*, in his Answer to the *Jesuite*, all along to disprove that claim of Universal head of the whole Church, and *sect. 25. num. 12.* sheweth, "That after the conversion
" of the Emperors, the Bishops of *Rome* themselves were
" still elected or confirmed by them, without any title of
" Universal head; until that *John* Patriarch of *Constanti-*
" *nople*, having been countenanced in that title by *Mauri-*
" *tius* the Emperor, (who came afterward to be deposed
" and murdered by *Phocas*) *Phocas* conferred on *Boniface*
" the third that very honor, which two of his Predecessors
" had declaimed against as monstrous and blasphemous, if
" not Antichristian. And as he thus defends the power
and jurisdiction of particular Churches, and the chief Magistrate in them against the Pope, so doth he defend the power and supremacie of this Magistrate over all that live within the same jurisdiction: And therefore *sect. 26. num. 9.*
" doth set it down for a great and undoubted Rule given
" by *Optatus*; That wheresoever there is a Church, there
" the Church is in the Commonwealth, not the Commonwealth
" in the Church; and so also the Church was in the Roman
" Empire. The truth is, that at first, and while some smaller
parcels of the Roman Empire only were Christians, then these, being only of the Church, might it be said to be in the Commonwealth: first as being but a part, and next but a subordinate part of the whole Empire, or those that had jurisdictions therein: But after that the Government it self became Christian, then was there no question to be

rightly made, which was in which? that is, whether the Church in the Commonwealth, or that in the Church: For that both were one, and both to be conceived included under that name of highest honor, the name of *Church*, importing as well our relation to God, as to one another. Whereupon also, since, for some Ages, the authority of the Roman Empire did extend it self in a manner over all Nations that were Christian, it might well come to pass that, amongst the Writers of those times, the Roman and Catholick Church might be taken as equivalent and alike: which to use now, is an absurd contradiction, as implying a *particular-universal*; for none other it is to call any man a Roman Catholick. At the time the Emperor of *Rome* had the sovereignty or government of any Christian State, then and there had the Pope or chief Bishop of *Rome* the like sovereignty in ordering of the affairs of that Church, if the said Emperor so thought fit; and to depart from that obedience or communion, was then (as I conceive) not Schism alone, but Sedition also. But in case any that are neither within the Popes own territory nor jurisdiction, but in the proper jurisdiction of some other Prince, who yields only a voluntary conformity in doctrine and discipline to that Sea, as *Spain* and *France*, and other free Princes now do; then are they that make alteration against the liking of that Prince or Power under whom they live, not Schismatics against the Pope of *Rome*, but against him; and if he approve of their doctrine, they are neither Schismatics, nor Seditious: As was the case of our *Henry* the Eighth, and those his Subjects of the Church of *England* which followed him; and for ought I know, was the case of *Luther* also, in respect of his subjection to the Duke of *Saxony*.

11: For it is to be considered, that where the Jurisdiction doth divide and become independent, there doth the notion of Church divide also; as was to be seen in the Church of the *Jews*, after they fell into two distinct Govern-

Governments, to wit, that of *Judah*, and that of *Israel*. In which case although they had still but one divine Law and prescript form of Worship to live by, yet the Government of each Kingdom being un subordinate, they were each of them reckoned as a Church apart, and the good or ill Government of each of them attributed to none but the peculiar King thereof, even as proceeding from his proper observance or breach of the Law. And although the Primitive Churches in Saint *Johns* time had not yet any absolute Jurisdiction, yet since what they had was independent, we shall find that those Reproofs and Admonitions which were in the *Apocalyps* given to the *seven Churches*, are directed to their several *Angels* or Heads, apart, without any hint or notice of subordination to any other Catholick Head or Curate, save of CHRIST himself.

12. I must confess, that as the earnest desire and aim I have always had towards the silencing of disputes and civil commotions in Kingdoms, hath made me the more earnest and studious in pressing the power and authority of each Prince; so for common-peace sake again amongst Kings themselves, and for taking off those irregularities and oppressions which each of them, by this power, might inflict on their Subjects, I have many times entertained the thoughts of admittance of some such power like that claimed by the Bishop of *Rome*: But upon serious excogitation of the whole, I was brought to resolve, that in the plea and condition of power the Pope now standeth, the interposition of his authority would many times rather increase, then be effectual to prevent injustice, or silence differences; whether acted between a Prince and his own Subjects, or by one Prince upon another. As for example; some person or order of Princes Subjects, misliking their usage, appeal to *Rome*, as against injustice and oppression: He must then (to make his authority known to be useful) determine for one party or another, as his judgment shall be engaged.

If

If for the King, then is he but heightened and farther warranted to do the like: If for *Thomas a Becket*, or the Barons against him, as sometimes in *England*, then are Subjects encouraged towards sedition and civil war another time. Again, before he can be supposed rightly to interpose between Prince and Prince in the justice of their quarrels, they must all of them be brought to be of the same religion and persuasion with himself, or else equally averse, that he may be impartial. Suppose that might be done, yet since he may have kindred and relations, may he not in that case favor a Nephew, a *Cesar Borgia*, or the like, against him that ~~was~~^{is} no relation? or may he not respect interest and application, so as again to favor such an one as King *John*, not only above his Barons, but other Princes too, upon resignation of his Crown to be held of him and his successors. But that was not all; for partiality, and the like, is but that which the Subjects of any Monarch might object against his absolute rule: But the great difference and difficulty is, that since the absolute Monarch was in all causes and over all persons in his dominions supreme Governor, there was hereby a sure way for prevention of civil war and disturbance; which, being the chief political evil, would recompence those sufferings of inferior nature, which could but occasionally happen, and never be so general. Whereas he claiming but Ecclesiastical power only, and it being not at all determined or agreed upon what is certainly so, or not so, (for prevention of question thereabouts) I saw no possible hope to attain peace by his umpirage, (if any should say he did exceed his Commission) unless he could make himself Judge of that too, and so by degrees, and *in ordine ad spiritualia*, draw in cognisance of all matters whatsoever. When that is done, as *Constantines* Throne will better become him than *S. Peters* Chair; so truly if such an Universal Christian Monarch there were, (which is not likely to fall to be he) there might much good arise by it, as to the general increase of Christian peace and profession: As for that other way found out by some of that side,

side, mentioned by the late Archbishop, *scilicet* 26. *num.* 11. for advance of his Supremacie, namely by setting up again one Emperor over all Christendom to rule in secular matters, while himself would rule him, and them too, in what he would call spiritual, with as supereminent splendor as the Sun doth the Moon, I apprehend it still ineffectual to peace, till those powers be joyned in one person; unless the Emperor could indeed be content (as I said) to change places with him, and become so subordinate as not to shine in any act of Moon-like power, but by the light and leave of this his Sun. Could this in any likelihood have been expected, I might happily then have given some credit to those slender probabilities of *S. Peters* primacie, and the Popes succession in the chair. In the mean time, the usurped exercise of this his Ecclesiastick power, where he had no jurisdiction, as a power standing insubordinate to the Prince, hath begotten that great mistake, That there might be a Church in a Church, that is, one Christian Commonwealth in another.

13. But let us hear judicious Mr. *Hooker* more at large in this business of the Church, and in answer to such as would appropriate the notion of Church to those of their own persuasion only, (*lib.* 5. *fol.* 367.) "*Church* is a word which Art hath devised, thereby to sever and distinguish that society of men which professeth the true Religion, from the rest which professeth it not. There have been in the world, from the very first foundation thereof, but three Religions: *Paganism*, which lived in the blindness of corrupted and depraved nature; *Judaism*, embracing the Law, which reformed Heathenish impiety, and taught salvation to be looked for through one, whom God in the last days would send and exalt to be Lord of all; finally *Christian belief*, which yieldeth obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and acknowledgeth him the Saviour whom God did promise. Seeing then that the *Church* is a name which Art hath given to Professors of true Religion; as they which will define a man, are to pass by

by those qualities wherein one man doth excel another, and to take only those essential properties whereby a man doth differ from creatures of other kinds: So he that will teach what the Church is, shall never rightly perform the work whereabout he goeth, till, in matter of Religion, he touch that difference which severeth the Churches religion from theirs who are not of the Church. Religion being therefore a matter partly of contemplation, partly of action, we must define the Church, which is a religious society, by such differences as do properly explain the essence of such things; that is to say, by the object or matter whereabout the contemplations and actions of the Church are properly conversant: For so all Knowledges and all Vertues are defined: Whereupon, because the only object which separateth ours from other Religions, is *Jesus Christ*, in whom none but the Church doth believe, and whom none but the Church doth worship; we find that accordingly the Apostles do every where distinguish hereby the Church from Infidels and from Jews; accounting them which call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to be his Church. If we go lower, we shall but add unto this certain casual and variable accidents which are not properly of the being, but make only for the happier and better being of the Church of God, either indeed, or in mens opinions and conceits. This is the error of all Popish definitions that hitherto have been brought: They define not the Church by that which the Church essentially is, but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect then the rest are. Touching parts of eminencie and perfection, parts likewise of imperfection and defect in the Church of God, they are infinite, their degrees and differences no way possible to be drawn unto any certain account. There is not the least contention and variance, but it blemisheth somewhat the unity that ought to be in the Church of Christ; which notwithstanding may have not only, without loss of essence or breach of concord, her manifold varieties in Rites and
Cere-

Ceremonies of Religion, but also her strifes and contentions many times, and that about matters of no small importance; yea, her schisms, factions, and such other evils whereunto the body of the Church is subject, sound and sick remaining both of the same body, as long as both parts retain, by outward profession, that vital substance of Truth, which maketh Christian Religion to differ from theirs which acknowledg not our Lord Jesus Christ the blessed Saviour of mankind, give no credit to his glorious Gospel, and have his Sacraments, the seal of eternal life, in derision. Now the priviledg of the visible Church of God (for of that we speak) is to be herein like the Ark of *Noah*; for any thing we know to the contrary, all without are lost sheep. Yet in this was the Ark of *Noah* priviledged above the Church; that whereas none of them which were in the one could perish, numbers in the other are cast away, because to eternal life our profession is not enough. Many things exclude from the Kingdom of God, although from the Church they separate not. In the Church there arise sundry grievous storms, by means whereof whole Kingdoms and Nations professing Christ, both have been heretofore, and are at this present day divided about Christ. During which division and contentions amongst men, albeit each part do justifie it self, yet the one of necessity must needs erre, if there be any contradiction between them, be it great or little: And what side soever it be that hath the truth, the same we must also acknowledg alone to hold *wish the true Church in that point*, and consequently reject the other as an enemy, *in that case, fallen away from the true Church*: Wherefore of hypocrites and dissemblers, whose profession at the first was but only from the teeth outward, when they afterwards took occasion to oppugn certain principal Articles of Faith, the Apostles which defended the truth against them, pronounce them gone out from the fellowship of sound and sincere Believers, when as yet the Christian religion they had not utterly cast off. In

like sense and meaning, throughout all Ages, Hereticks
 have been justly hated as branches cut off from the body
 of the true Vine; yet only so far forth cut off, as their
 Heresies have extended. Both Heresie and many other
 crimes which wholly sever from God, do sever from the
 Church of God in part only. The mysterie of Piety, saith
 the Apostle, is without peradventure great: *GOD hath*
been manifested in the flesh, hath been justified in the Spirit,
hath been seen of Angels, hath been preached to Nations,
hath been believed on in the world, hath been taken up into
glory. The Church a pillar and foundation of this truth,
 which no where is known or profess'd but only within the
 Church, and they all of the Church that profess it. In the
 mean while it cannot be denied, that many profess this,
 who are not therefore cleered simply from all either faults
 or errors, which maketh separation between us and the
 Wel-spring of our happiness. Idolatry severed of old the
 Israelites; Iniquity, those Scribes and Pharisees from God,
 who notwithstanding were a part of the seed of Abraham,
 a part of that very seed which God did himself acknow-
 ledg to be his Church. The Church of God may there-
 fore contain both them which indeed are not his, yet must
 be reputed his by us, that know not their inward thoughts;
 and them, whose apparent wickedness testifieth even in
 the sight of the whole world, that God abhorreth them.
 For to this, and no other purpose, are meant those Para-
 bles which our Saviour in the Gospel hath concerning
 mixture of Vice with Vertue, Light with Darknes, Truth
 with Error; as well an openly known and seen, as a cun-
 ningly cloaked mixture. That which therefore separateth
 utterly, that which cutteth off clean from the visible
 Church of Christ, is plain Apostacie, direct denial, utter
 rejection of the whole Christian faith, as far as the same is
 professedly different from Infidelity. Hereticks, as touch-
 ing those points of Doctrine wherein they fail: Schisma-
 ticks, as touching the quarrels for which, or the duties
 wherein they divide themselves from their brethren:

Loose,

Loose, licentious, and wicked persons, as touching their
several offences and crimes, have all forsaken the true
Church of God, the Church which is sound and sincere
in the doctrine that they corrupt, the Church that keep-
eth the bond of unity which they violate, the Church
which walketh in the ways of righteousness which they
transgress; the very true Church of Christ they have left,
howbeit not altogether left nor forsaken simply the
Church, upon the main foundations whereof they con-
tinue built, notwithstanding those breaches whereby they
are rent from bottom to top asunder.

And having largely discoursed on the same argument in
the beginning of his third Book, he proceeds to reprove
such, as being then members of this Church, would anni-
hilate her being truly a Church, and claim an independen-
cie because of some corruptions they conceived in her.
As there are (saith he, fol. 86.) which make the Church
of Rome utterly no Church at all, by reason of so many
grievous errors in their Doctrine; so we have them a-
mongst us, who under pretence of imagined corruptions
in our Discipline, do give even as hard a judgment of the
Church of England it self. And afterwards, f. 88. coming
to distinguish the visible Church into parts according to
their several jurisdictions, to the end that authority there-
of might be made useful, he farther saith: "For prefer-
vation of Christianity, there is not any thing more need-
ful, then that such as are of the visible Church have mu-
tual fellowship and society one with another. In which
consideration, as in the main body of the Sea being one,
yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Ca-
tholick Church is in like sort divided into a number of di-
stinct societies, every of which is termed a Church within
it self. In this sense the Church is always a visible society
of men; not an Assembly, but a society. For although
the name of the Church be given unto Christian assem-
blies, although any multitude of Christian men congre-
gated may be termed by the name of a Church; yet As-

semblies properly are rather things that belong to a Church. Men are assembled for performance of publike actions, which actions being ended, the Assembly dissolveth it self, and is no longer in being; whereas the Church which was assembled, doth no less continue afterwards then before. Where but three are, and they of the Laity also, saith *Tertullian*, yet there is a Church, that is to say, a Christian Assembly. But a Church, as now we are to understand it, is a Society, that is, a number of men belonging unto some Christian fellowship, the place and limits whereof are certain. That wherein they have communion, is the publike exercise of such duties as those mentioned in the Apostles *Acts*, Instruction, Breaking of bread, Prayers. As therefore they that are of the mystical body of Christ, have those inward graces and vertues, whereby they differ from all others which are not of the same body; even so again, whosoever appertain to the visible body of the Church, they have also the notes of external profession, whereby the world knoweth what they are. After the same manner, even the severall Societies of Christian men, unto every of which the name of a Church is given with addition betokening severalty, as the Church of *Rome*, *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *England*, and so the rest, must be endued with correspondent general properties belonging unto them, as they are publike Christian societies. And of such properties common unto all societies Christian, it may not be denied, that one of the very chiefest is Ecclesiastical Politie. Which word I therefore the rather use, because the name of Government, as commonly men understand it in ordinary speech, doth not comprise the largeness of that whereunto in this question it is applied: For when we speak of Government, what doth the greatest part conceive thereby, but only the exercise of superiority peculiar unto Rulers and Guides of others? To our purpose therefore the name of *Church-Politie* will better serve, because it containeth both Government, and also whatsoever besides belongeth to the ordering

ordering of the Church in publike. Neither is any thing in this degree more necessary then Church-Politie, which is a form of ordering the publike spiritual affairs of the Church of God. But we must note, that he which affirmeth Speech to be necessary amongst all men throughout the world, doth not thereby import that all men must necessarily speak one kind of language: Even so the necessity of Politie and Regiment in all Churches may be held, without holding any one certain Form to be necessary in them all, &c.

15. From all which discourse these Conclusions are plainly deducible, as touching the preservation of Peace and Charity. First, that the imputation of Heresie, Schism, or the like, cannot by particular Churches be so charged upon one another, as to take from them the reality of being true Christian Churches, whilst they hold the foundation: And much less, that any such imputation from any the sons or members of any Church should be held of avail to take that respect which is due unto her as a Church of Christ, and debar her from exercising his authority on earth; and that not only for keeping of love and union, but for preservation of Christianity it self, which is also needful to be upheld by observation of the Rules of Society and Government in the Church, as well as in the Commonwealth.

16. That to a Church, as now the word is applied, Polity and Regiment being proper, that therefore no sort of persons wanting this power, but living under it or any other Christian jurisdiction, can assume to themselves the notion of a Church, although they should consist of such as were of the order of the Clergy. In which condition, since the notion of Church could be no otherwise appropriate then to import a Congregation or Assembly, it might be given to the Laity also, as he avoucheth out of *Tertullian*.

17. And next we may observe what those things be that are to be publicly exercised, and wherein the members

bers of each Church are to have communion, and which
 do fall within the Churches authority and cognisance, as
Instruction, Breaking of bread, and Prayers; that is to say,
 to order and regulate the publike use of Preaching, Admi-
 nistration of Sacraments, of Prayers, or other form of
 Service or Worship. So that when any Church shall think
 fit to make any new appointment in any thing of these
 kinds, *It is not fit* (as he elsewhere saith) *for those that are*
members thereof, to ask why we hang our judgments on the
Churches sleeve? and out of stubbornness and disrespect
 to her authority, to go about to perswade men to inconfor-
 mity; by making them believe, that obedience to alteration
 in these things is hazardous or destructive to their sal-
 vation: Not regarding the difference which ought to be
 put between things of the one and the other sort, in respect
 of power to change. "Touching points of Doctrine (saith
 'he, *lib. 3. fol. 110, 111.*) as for example, The Unity of God,
 'the Trinity of Persons, Salvation by Christ, the Resurre-
 'ction of the body, Life everlasting, the Judgment to come,
 'and such like; they have been, since the first hour that
 'there was a Church in the world, and till the last they
 'must be believed. But as for matters of Regiment, they
 'are, for the most part, of another nature. To make new
 'Articles of Faith and Doctrine, no man thinketh it lawfull:
 'New Laws of Government, what Commonwealth or
 'Church is there which maketh not, either at one time or
 'another? *The rule of Faith, saith Tertullian, is but one,*
 'and that alone immoveable, and impossible to be framed or
 'cast anew. The Law of outward Order and Politie, not so.
 'There is no reason in the world wherefore we should
 'esteem it as necessary always to do, as always to believe
 'the same things; seeing every man knoweth that the
 'matter of Faith is constant, the matter contrariwise of
 'Actions daily changeable, especially the matter of action
 'belonging unto Church-Politie. Neither can I find that
 'men of soundest judgments have any otherwise taught,
 'then that Articles of belief, and things which all men must
 of

of necessity do to the end they may be saved, are either expressly set down in the Scripture, or else plainly thereby to be gathered. But touching things which belong to Discipline and outward Politie, the Church hath authority to make Canons, Laws and Decrees, even as we read in the Apostles times it did. Which kind of Laws (for as much as they are not in themselves necessary to salvation) may, after they are made, be also changed, as the difference of times or places shall require.

18. So that then we may resolve, that as the true essence of a Church (as a Church) doth depend on the doctrine and profession of the faith of Jesus Christ, and the authority from him received; so doth the essence and force of Discipline and outward Polity depend on her authority only. It is from her power, as a Church, that they are made of this or that form: It is not from any form in them, as thus or thus made, that her being or power can be thought to depend.

19. And therefore surely if the Church have power to alter and change when they are made, as well as to make *Canons, Laws, and Decrees*; it must follow, that those that are members of that Church, are also tied to obedience, Clergy as well as others; as he (*lib. 5. fol. 391.*) urgeth against the Non-conforming Ministers of those times, *viz.* Why oppose they the name of a Minister in this case unto the state of a private man? do their Orders exempt them from obedience to Laws? That which their office and place requireth, is to shew themselves Patterns of reverend subjection, not Authors and Masters of contempt towards Ordinances; the strength whereof when they seek to weaken, they do but in truth discover to the world their own imbecilities, which a great deal wiselier they might conceal. So that we may find that he is no ways countenancing those that think their Orders do exempt them from the common relation of subjection, as if they had Church-power apart: But he is very precise and peremptory in reproof of such as, in those times, thought they

they might oppose the Ordinances of their then Church-Governors, upon the score of their Function. As if because they had (as they said) received their Commission and authority to preach, to administer, and the like, from God; that therefore in the manner, order, and other circumstances how they should be performed, they should not be tied to the constitutions of men, farther then they were agreeable to the Word of God; even in such strict sense agreeable, as to find expresse Texts for them; if nor, their being agreeable to the general sense and scope thereof, would not (as they taught) suffice to conform their obedience, when as yet they could bring no Text in disproof of them. No, if they wanted this, then they would (as he said elsewhere) *make their childish appeals* to the usage of other Churches which had no authority over them at all. And therefore I see not how any of that Order now can turn Non-conformists to our publick Communion, when (on the one hand) they cannot so much as pretend there is any thing retained not agreeable to the Word of God, and (on the other) they cannot aheadg the example of any one Church now in being, whose practise is conformable to them in those things wherein they do dissent. These, I am sure, may be justly accounted guilty of Apostacie from those Principles formerly maintained by the famous and Orthodox men of the Church of *England*, rather then such as will not, through private discontent and dislike of persons commanding and in power, shew stubbornness to the command and power it self. The which when it is by any done, is so far from giving any reputation to them, as men of Orders, Learning, or Gravity, that it *doth but discover to the world their own imbecility*, (in respect of some peevish prejudice whereby they are swayed) *which a great deal wiselier they might conceal.*

20. And because, in these cases again, it is not to be supposed otherwise now then amongst Nonconformists formerly, that is, that some having their necessities and wants greater, or being more fearful and conscientious in open oppo-

opposition, are ready outwardly to yield to compliance, and yet do underhand deprave and discountenance the deed it self, and that Authority which they do obey therein. Of these he saith, *lib. 5. fol. 248. They do like one* 'that should openly profess he putteth fire to his neighbours house, but yet to halloweth it with his prayers that he hopeth it shall not burn. It had therefore perhaps been safer, and better for ours to have observed *S. Basils* advice both in this, and all things of like nature; let him which approveth not his Governours Ordinances, either plainly (but privately alwayes) shew his dislike, if he have *λόγον* *χρῆνον*, strong and invincible reason against them, according to the true will and meaning of Scripture: Or else let him quietly with silence do that which is enjoyned; obedience with protest unwillingnesse to obey, is no better then manifest disobedience.

21. And therefore in these cases, men should not go about to disturbe the peace of the Church, *that pillar and ground of truth*, which for peace and order sake, God hath appointed to be obeyed in establishing things of this nature, upon every plausible argument which by means of their abilities and learning, they are able to bring in disparagement of any thing established by her; They must rest obedient in all such things as they cannot finde *strong and invincible reason* against, according to the true will, and meaning of Scripture, whose drift is Peace and Order; and not according to their will and meaning onely, who it may be have contrary designes; no, he disclaims all such kinde of proofs as ineffectuall in this case. 'For (saith he) *lib. 5. fol. 201. Where the Word of God leaveth the Church to make choice of her own ordinances*; If against those things which have been received with great reason, or against that which the Ancient practise of the Church hath continued time out of mind; or against such Ordinances as the power and authority of that Church under which we live hath it selfe devised for the publique good, or against the discretion of the Church in mitigating sometimes, with fa-

'vorable equity that rigour which otherwise the literal ge-
 'nerality of Ecclesiastical Laws, hath judged to be more
 'convenient and meet, it should be lawfull for men to re-
 'ject at their own liberty, what they see done and practi-
 'sed according to order set down; If in so great variety
 'of wayes, as the will of man is easily able to find out to-
 'wards any purpose, and in so great liking as all men especi-
 'ally have on those inventions, whereby some one shall seem
 'to have been more inlightned from above then many
 'thousands, the Church did give every man license to follow
 'what himself imagineth that *Gods Spirit* doth reveal unto
 'him, or what he supposeth that God is likely to have
 'revealed to some other, whose vertues deserve to be high-
 'ly esteemed, what other effect could hereupon ensue, but
 'the utter confusion of his Church, under pretence of be-
 'ing taught, led, and guided by his Spirit? The gifts and
 'graces whereof do so naturally all tend unto common
 'peace, that where such singularity is, they whose hearts it
 'professeth ought to suspect it the more; in as much as if
 'it did come of God, and should for that cause prevail
 'with others, the same God which revealeth it to them,
 'would also give them power of confirming it unto others,
 'either with miraculous operation, or with strong and in-
 'vincible remonstrance of sound reason; such as where-
 'by it might appear that God would indeed have all mens
 'judgements give place unto it: Whereas now the Errour
 'and insufficiency of their Arguments doth make it, on the
 'contrary side, against them a strong presumption, that God
 'hath not moved their hearts to think such things, as he
 'hath not enabled them to prove.

22. In this last quotation he is very expresse concern-
 'ing the power of that Church under which we live; and
 'that even in *devising ordinances for the publike good there-*
 'of: The which to oppose is, so far from shewing it self a
 'fruit of the Spirit, that by that dissention and discord which
 'it must necessarily produce, it may be suspected to have
 'proceeded from some other Master then the *God of peace,*
 and

and some other principle then the *Gospel of Peace*, even from the *God of this World*, some powerfull temptation sent by the *Prince of the air*, whereby he is wont to rule in the hearts of the children of disobedience. If God do not therefore in this case furnish them with one of those sorts of invincible proofs by him set down, that is, either *power of miracle*, or such strong and invincible Remonstrance as to cause all mens judgements to give place; their opposition is to be suspected as proceeding from affected singularity or worse.

23. For if in those things wherein controversie is, whether they be warranted by Scripture, or by the Catholick Church, as Fathers, Councils, or the like, such as live under any Christian authority should take upon them to be judges, they should then usurpe that proper cognisance and power which is peculiar to the Church onely; and leave her nothing to doe. For since in points fundamentall, or fully agreed upon, her power reacheth not, it must follow, that to her alone it belongeth, out of that variety of interpretation made of the meaning of the Texts themselves, and out of that variety and contradiction which is found amongst Councils, Fathers, and other Writers, to make choice of, and give determination for what sort of doctrine or regiment she shall finde, either to have been most Catholiquely received, or to be grounded upon most Orthodox Principles, and soundest reason: Which done, for men to say the Church hath no power to institute, or or take away, contrary to the Word of God, and then produce no other Texts for condemning her in any particular, then what are by others interpreted otherwise, and also after the same manner she hath done already, doth certainly argue great arrogance, and stubbornness of mind, in them that would thus apply it, although the speech in it self be most true.

24. And no lesse then so it is, when out of the Sentences of some Councils, Fathers, or other Writers, the doctrine and authority of the Catholike Church is alledged, to take off our obedience to that Church under which we live:

It being none other in points of controversie in Religion ; then if in Civill suits and debates, the parties in contention should appeal from the Laws of that Common wealth, to the Verdict of the *Civil Law*, and avouch the Testimony of *Ulpian*, *Papinian*, or the like, for the meaning thereof : Or to the *Law of Nations*, and then prove there is such a Law, and to be just so construed, because some men whom they esteem well of, have so thought. If there be no controversie about the truth or equity of what they propound, but all men are found to agree ; why then it is a sign God did make the discovery to them , since he hath thus enabled them to prove it : If not, how can they think but reasonable, even for peace and order sake, if not for her own sake, that that side and determination which in this controversie agrees with the Church, should be preferred to that which is chosen by them. And therefore if the Church may devise new Rites, and must for Peace sake be obeyed, then certainly when she doth not devise any thing new, (by way of addition) nor so much as retain what was before taken as scandalous in things that were ancient, I do not see any *invincible reason*, no nor reason at all for Schisme or separation.

25. And as for that power of mitigation what the general and literal rigour of Ecclesiasticall Laws hath set down, as he spake it in justification of what was by the then Civill Magistrate, (or a power from her) dispensed with in the cases of *Plurality*, *Non-residence*, and the like ; so it may also truly inform us, that if for the further enabling men in the study of Divinity, and consequently in the gift of preaching, (nay even for their temporal maintenance sake) these general Laws and Rules of the Church were dispensed with while the same was still remaining and in power. Much more may men now, (out of the rule of justice, and charity, both to themselves and others) think themselves dispensed with the omission of some Rites and Ceremonies, and of reading the Service Book, when as, not a dispensation alone, but a strict injunction against the use of them is
by

by the like soveraign power apparently made ; and that Church also whose Laws they were, hath neither force or being. Charity I say, both publike and private, when as both preaching it self, and the maintenance to rise thereby, have so necessary a dependance on the forbearance of them. If Preachers that had other places to live on, and preach in, might out of particular favour to them, or some other person whose Chaplains they were, be thus dispensed with, as we know they were, and that they then readily enough made use of it ; may we not conclude that both the rule of Charity to ones self, and of generall charity to others (that may reap good by their Doctrine) will excuse them, in a time when their own maintenance, and the exercise of preaching, doth wholly rely upon their obedience in this kinde ? So that seem the thing never so strange and new, either in respect of addition, or subtraction, to what was formerly done and established, it is not by those that are Members, and do live within the jurisdiction thereof to be disobeyed, as out of scandal at alteration : the Church having power, as well to subtract as to institute ; And therefore he saith, *lib. 5. fol. 196.* ‘ All things cannot be of ancient continuance, which are expedient and needfull for the ordering of spiritual affairs : But the Church being a body which dieth not, hath alwayes power as occasion requireth, no lesse to ordain that which never was, then to ratifie what hath been before. To prescribe the order of doing all things, is a peculiar prerogative which wisdom hath as Queen or Soveraign Commandress over other vertues. This in every severall mans actions of common life, appertaineth unto Morall, in publike and politick secular affairs unto civill Wisdom. In like manner to devise any certain form for the outward administration of publike duties in the service of God, or things belonging thereunto, and to find out the most convenient rule for that use, is a point of wisdom Ecclesiasticall. It is not for a man which doth know, or should know, what order is, and what peaceable government requireth ; to ask why

we should hang our judgement upon the Churches sleeve?
 and why in matters of Order, more then in matters of
 Doctrine; The Church hath Authority to establish that
 for an Order at one time, which at another time it may
 abolish, and in both do well. Then which nothing could
 in my opinion, have been spoken more pointing to Peace,
 and silencing of disputes in our present alterations, and to
 the satisfaction of such as think that those forms of Prayer
 and administration of Sacraments, Ordination, and other
 publike Rites and Ceremonies may not by a succeeding
 Church and Power therein be lawfully taken away,
 like as they were by a former established.

26. And that specially, if to those that have the oversight
 of these things, there shall seem to be superstition incident
 to the use of them, through some over-value and mistake,
 which through frequent use, might be cast towards them;
 as though they were indeed Fundamentals of themselves.
'Superstition (saith he, lib. 5. fol. 191.) such as that of the Pharisees,
 by whom divine things indeed were lesse, because other
 things were more divinely esteemed of then reason would.
 The Superstition that riseth voluntary and by degrees,
 which are hardly discerned, mingleth it self with the Rites
 even of every divine service done to the onely true God,
 must be considered of, as a creeping and incroaching
 evill; an evill, the beginnings whereof are commonly
 harmlesse: So that it proveth onely then to be an evill,
 when some farther accident doth grow unto it, or it self
 come unto further growth; for in the Church of God
 sometimes it cometh to passe, as in over-battle grounds,
 the fertile disposition whereof is good; yet because it
 exceedeth due proportion, it bringeth forth abundantly,
 through too much ranknesse, things lesse profitable;
 whereby that which principally it should yeeld, being
 either prevented in place, or defrauded of nourishment
 faileth. This (if so large a discourse were necessary)
 might be exemplified by heaps of Rites and Customes,
 now superstitious in the greatest part of the
 Christian

Christian world, which in their first originall beginnings, when the strength of vertuous, devout, or charitable affection bloomed them, no man could justly have condemned them as evill: whereby it is still plain that things good and profitable in their first institution, and settled upon good advice and great authority, may by a succeeding age and Church be found prejudiciall, and that then that Church hath power to take away and abolish that which the other did institute.

27. And again, much to the same purpose, and in answer to such as think things once well and solemnly established, cannot be altered, he saith, *l. 4. fol. 165.* True it is, that neither Councils, nor Customes, be they never so ancient and so general, can let the Church from taking away that thing which is hurtful to be retained. Where things have been instituted, which being convenient and good at the first, do afterward in proceſſe of time wax otherwise; we make no doubt but they may be altered, yea, though Councils or Customes General have received them. And therefore it is but a needless kind of opposition which they make who thus dispute. If in those things which are not expresse in the Scripture, that is to be observed of the Church, which is the custome of the people of God, and decree of our Forefathers, then how can these things at any time be varied, which heretofore have been once ordained in such sort? Whereto we say, that things so ordained are to be kept, howbeit not necessarily any longer then till there grow any urgent cause to ordain the contrary. For there is not any positive Law of men, whether it be general or particular, received by former expresse consent, as in Councils; or by secret approbation, as in Customs it cometh to passe, but the same may be taken away, if occasion serve. Even as we all know, that many things kept generally heretofore, are now in like sort generally unkept, and abolished every where. By which we may further finde, that as it is the duty of the Members of any Church to conform to such Rights and Orders

Orders as the Authority thereof shall institute and set up; so also can no plea of former establishment, whether by Councils or Customes, warrant their opposition or incoformity, if the Church under which they live shall think fit to abrogate them; when they find urgent cause to the contrary. No he accounts *it but a needless kinde of opposition to urge in these disputes*, the custome of the people of God, or the decree of our Fore-fathers; as if for the necessary continuance of Peace and Order, there were not the same degree of respect due to a succeeding Church, by her present children, as was given to the former Church, and such as were our Forefathers therein. Can we fancie that the establishment we doe now approve might be made in place of what the Church preceding it had made before, and yet think the Church under which we live cannot do the like, in disanulling some things made by the Church preceding us.

28. But now if all this while, it should be allowed that this power should be in the Church; yet what and if some mens greater affection and interest cast towards other persons then those that had the present managing of Religious affairs, might make them conjecture that rather they then these ought in these things to be obeyed; and what and if they might withall doubt, that him they called the Civill Magistrate should have power to order affairs of the Church as head thereof; we will therefore set down what he farther inferreth, *fol. 567.* 'The Lord God of Israel hath given the kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even to him and his sons, by a Covenant of Salt. And ~~Job 36. 8.~~ bringing in that place of *Cant. 8. 11.* Solomon had a Vineyard in Baalhamon, he gave the Vineyard unto keepers, every one bringing for the fruit thereof a thousand pieces of silver, &c. 'He saith it is true, this is meant of the Mystical Head set over the body which is not seen; but as Christ hath reserved the mystical administration of the Church invisible to himself, so hath he committed the mystical government of Congregations, visible to the Sons of David, by the same Covenant; whose Sons they are

'are in governing of the flock of Christ, whomsoever
'the Holy Ghost hath set over them to go before them,
'and lead them in their several pastures, one in this Con-
'gregation, another in that; As it is written, *Take heed*
'*to your selves, and to all the flock, whereof the Holy Ghost*
'*hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he*
'*hath purchased with his own blood.* And presently after
to shew who he means by those *Overseers*, he saith, The
'Pope hath fawned upon the Kings and Princes of the earth,
'and by spiritual couzenage hath made them sell their
'lawful Authorities and Jurisdictions for titles of *Catholi-*
'*cus Christianissimus, Defensor fidei,* and such like. And a-
gain fol. 569. complaining of the unnatural usage of some
towards their Mother, that were natural children of this
Church, under a misguided conceit that Obedience was
not due to the then Queen *Elizabeth*, but to another; he
saith, 'That by this means the bowels of the child, may be
'made the mothers grave, and that it hath caused no small
'number of our brethen to forsake their native Country,
'and with all disloyalty to cast off the yoke of their allegi-
'ance to our dread Sovereign; whom God in mercy hath
'set over them; for whose safeguard, if they carried not the
'hearts of Tygers in the bosomes of men, they would think
'the dearest blood in their bodies well spent; and present-
ly after he reckons up the faults charged by the Popish
party upon them, and for which they stood excommunica-
ted, as if they had been no Church, nor part thereof:
Viz. 'That the Queen had quite abolished prayers within
'her Realm; that we not only have no assemblies unto the
'Lord for Prayers, but to hold a Common School for sin
'and flattery; to hold Sacrilege to be Gods Service; Un-
'faithfulness and breach of promise to God, to give it to
'a strumpet, to be a vertue; to abandon fasting, to abhor
'confession, to mislike Penance, to like well of Usury, to
'charge none with restitution, to find no good before
'God in single life, nor in no well working; that all men
'as they fall to us, are much worsed, and more then afore-
'corrupted.

28. Now, to my thinking we are again fallen into that unhappy condition, as to have the same, or much like faults and scandals laid to the charge as well of those that are in Sovereign power, as of those that follow them, by such as out of like zeal to former publike usage and establishment, are ready upon the same arguments to turn Recusants to the present Orders of this Church; and yet to continue Recusants to the Popish Communion too. Not well considering how that as in one case, they must against our change, make use of their Arguments, so will they then be dis-furnished of replies to them, for that change by the Church of *England* formerly made, when a greater number of Ceremonies, and those of a more general approbation, and longer continuance in this Church, were by the authority of the Civill Magistrate (as they call him) taken away, and this form which they now cleave unto put in the place thereof.

And least any should object (like them) nullity and invalidity to our Church or her authority, through some scruple of the lawfulnessse and calling of our present Pastors and Ministers in the exercise of their Functions, because of the want of some Forms and Ceremonies heretofore appointed to be used in their Ordination before they were permitted to preach, or administer, and consequently think it unlawfull to hear or receive at their hands, we shall finde him of another minde; nay though they were not at all in Orders, or claimed any mission from Authority: For he saith, *lib. 5. fol. 227.* Nature as much as possible inclineth to validities and preservations, dissolutions, and nullities of things done, are not onely not favoured, but hated; when either urged without cause, or extended beyond their reach: If therefore at any time it come to passe, that in teaching publicly or privately in delivering this blessed Sacrament of regeneration, some unsanctified hand, contrary to Christs supposed Ordinances, do intrude it self to others, which of these two Opinions seem more agreeable with equity,

ours

ours that disallow what is done amisse, yet make not the force of the Word and Sacraments, much lesse their nature, and very substance to depend on the Ministers Authority and Calling, or else theirs which defeat, disanull, and annihilate both, in respect of that one onely personal defect; there being not any Law of God which saith, That if the Minister be incompetent, his word shall be no word, his Baptisme, no Baptisme. He which teacheth and is not sent, loseth the reward, but yet retaineth the name of a teacher, his usurped actions have in him the same nature which they have in others, although they yeeld him not the same comfort. And if these two cases be peers, the case of Doctrine, and the case of Baptism both alike, sith no defect in their Vocation, that teach the truth, is able to take away this benefit thereof from him which heareth; wherefore should the want of a lawfull calling in them that baptize, make Baptism vain? And again, fol. 332: The Grace of Baptisme cometh by donation from God alone; that God hath committed the Ministry of Baptisme unto speciall men, it is for Orders sake in his Church, and not to the end that their Authority might give being, or adde force to the Sacrament it self. That Infants have right to the Sacrament of Baptism, we all acknowledge. Charge them we cannot as guilefull, and wrongful possessors of that whereunto they have right by the manifest will of the Donor, and are not parties unto any defect or disorder in the manner of receiving the same. And if any such disorder be, we have sufficiently before declared, that *Delictum cum capite semper ambulat*, Mens own fault's are their own harms. Wherefore to countervail this and the like mis chosen resemblances with that which more truly and plainly agreeth: The Ordinance of God concerning their vocation that minister Baptisme, wherein the Mystery of our regeneration is wrought, hath thereunto the same Analogy, which Laws of wedlock have to our first nativity and birth. So that if nature do effect Procreation notwithstanding the wick-

'ed violation and breach of Natures law, made that the
 'entrance of all mankind into this present world might be
 'without blemish; may we not justly presume that Grace
 'doth accomplish the other, although there be faultiness in
 'them which transgress the order which our Lord Jesus
 'Christ hath established in his Church? *And afterwards*
 'again, lib. 5. fol. 448. That therefore wherein a Minister
 'differeth from other Christian men, is not, as some have
 'childishly imagined, the sound preaching of the Word of
 'God, but as they are lawfully and truly Governors to
 'whom authority of regiment is given in the Common-
 'wealth, according to the order which Polity hath set; so
 'Canonical ordination in the Church of Christ is that
 'which maketh a lawful Minister, as touching the validity
 'of any act which appertaineth to the vocation. The cause
 'why S. Paul willed *Timothy* not to be overhasty in ordain-
 'ing Ministers, was (as we very well may conjecture) be-
 'cause Imposition of hands doth consecrate and make
 'them Ministers, whether they have gifts and qualities fit
 'for the laudable discharge of their duties, or no. If want
 'of Learning and skill to preach did frustrate their Vocati-
 'on, Ministers ordained before they be grown unto that
 'maturity, should receive new Ordination whensoever it
 'chanceth that study and industry doth make them after-
 'wards more able to perform the office; then which, what
 'conceit can be more absurd?

29. By those words of his, *That wherein a Minister*
differeth from other men, is as they are lawfully and truly
Governors, to whom authority of Regiment is given in the
Commonwealth, according to the order which Polity hath set;
 we may find him ~~more~~ against their judgments that would
 make Canonical ordination, and the validity of any act ap-
 pertaining to the vocation, to depend on any separate Ec-
 clesiastick authority. And when again he is saying, that they
 are lawfully and truly Governors, to whom authority of
 Regiment is given in the Commonwealth, according to
 the Order which Polity hath set; we may presume by the
 words

words *are, is, and hath*, he means that present Power and, those present *Overseers* which the *Holy Ghost* or Divine Providence hath placed over them, *as sons of David*, as was by him before rehearsed; and so making him the lawful Governor, whom the present Polity or Law hath set. For if he should admit other question of his lawfulness, by saying, *whom Polity should set*, or the like, he should then overthrow that course before set down in determining the lawfulness of Ministers sent by him, and leave no settled way for Peace or Order. He is therefore to be understood as concluding, that as the lawfulness of inferior Powers must for Peace and Orders sake depend on him, (who alone is to be held the *lawful and true Governor*, to this end) so his can depend on none but God. But of this more hereafter.

30. In the mean time it is to me a wonder, how those that do now so much insist upon the necessity of their agreement with that Doctrine and Discipline which was formerly set down by the Church of *England*, amongst which the frequent use of Sermons and Sacraments were set down as duties necessary to our Christian profession, (if not salvation) can now be so much changed from their first principles, as to decline those means and instruments which by the providence of God are for the present sent us to that very end, and that only for want of such like formality of induction or institution which the Rule of the Church or State did in that case formerly appoint; and can now, even while they do profess their constancie in the same belief, go about to perswade against effectualness of administration, either in one kind or other, through any such like objection. More likely to my thinking it should follow, that since there is such a great necessity still remaining in the frequent use of these things, and since such manner of ordination, induction, and other qualifications as they themselves have received, can only warrant men to be right hearers or receivers, that therefore it is incumbent on them as a necessary duty to be doing hereof, for fear of that sentence, *Wo if I preach not.* In

31. In which case if we shall compare the cause and prosecution of Nonconformists now in their scandal in matters of abridgment with those exceptions and that demeanor therein, which the former Nonconformists made against the Churches too great imposition in that kind, we may (as I conceive) attribute more reason and Christian charity and moderation to them, than these. For amongst them it was held for a Maxim, That they would rather preach in a Fools coat, then be deprived of that benefit which might come by their Ministry and preaching. And this the discreeter and more moderate sort did; although the doing of a thing conceived to be unlawful by the Law of God, be more to be scrupled at then the forbearance of a thing held lawful by the authority of the Church, which, in the condition they then stood in, would not suffer them to be Preachers, without actual use of the Surplice, or the like: whereas amongst us, neither subscription, nor use of any thing in the like kind, is by present Authority enjoined.

32. And as for those that so much stand upon the former institutions of the Service-book, and other Rites and Ceremonies, if we should have respect only to abolished Laws, yet do I not find that it is any where said, that no Sermon or Sacrament shall at any time be held lawfully or effectually made or done, when these shall not be also used: But the intention of the Act of *Uniformity* (as an Act of *Uniformity*) must be construed, that in the times appointed for the use of such like things, that then, for preservation of peace and uniformity in the Church, none other but those shall be used. Doth the Act any where say, or can any presume it did mean, that no man should preach at any time a Sermon, or come to hear others do so, unless, at the same time, the Service-book, or part of it were read? No certainly, if we consider the injunction, as to persons, it will be plain it lies not upon Preachers as Preachers, but upon such as had fixed ministerial charge in delivering of the Sacraments, or the like, to the which the Book had chief

chief reference ; and not enjoined on them neither, if they had *Vicars* or *Curates* to do it. It is not said, if any *Preacher*, *Pastor*, or *Lecturer* shall refuse ; nor was ever so construed. For experience tells us, that never any did do it when they preached, if they cou'd have it conveniently omitted or done by others ; being, while the Law was in force, seldom read by Bishop, Dean, or Doctor, but left to those of inferior sort, however now it be pressed as necessary.

33. And if we consider the intent of the words directing to the use of this Book or Form, they must be construed by way of seclusion of all other. Which will be manifest to such unprejudiced persons as shall consider how the whole scope of the Act doth condemn such as did by *speech* or *action* derogate or deprave against the use of the Service-book or Ceremonies, as unfit or unlawful, and not those that did approve them : And therefore it prescribes no punishment to such as in obedience to Authority, do, against their own liking, forbear to use or hear it ; but such as, notwithstanding the authority of the Church, do *refuse* it, out of contempt of their power, or better liking to some other form ; saying, *If any manner of Parson, Vicar, or other Minister whatsoever, that ought or should sing or say Common Prayer mentioned in the said Book, or minister the Sacraments, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming, refuse to use the said Common-Prayer, or to minister the Sacraments in such Cathedral or Parish-Church or other places, as he should use to minister the same, in such order and form as they be mentioned and set forth in the said Book, or shall, wilfully and obstinately standing in the same, use any other Rite, Ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating the Lords Supper, openly or privily, or Mattens, Evensong, Administration of the Sacraments, or other open prayers, then is mentioned and set forth in the said Book, &c.* But then again in case they do not refuse, but have been willing and made offer of doing it, and have been by others disturbed in the use of that, or made to use an-
other

other ; why then, by the judgment of that very Act, they are not comprised in any blame. But the punishment laid on such as should by *open fact, deed, or by open threatenings* compel or cause, or otherwise procure or maintain any Parson, Vicar, or other Minister in any Cathedral or Parish-Church, or in Chappel, or in any other place, to sing or say any Common or open Prayer, or to minister any Sacrament, otherwise or in any other manner and form then is mentioned in the said Book ; or by any of the said means shall unlawfully interrupt or let any Parson, Vicar, or other Minister in any Cathedral or Parish-Church, Chappel, or any other place, to sing or say any Common and open Prayer, or to minister the Sacraments or any of them, in such manner and form as is mentioned in the said Book ; that then every such person, being lawfully convicted in form abovesaid, shall forfeit to the Queen our Sovereign Lady, her heirs and successors, for the first offence an hundred marks. And so the Act goes on, prescribing still greater punishments for the second and third offences, by way of mulct to the Queen and her Successors.

34. But now, what if her Successors come to enact against the use of it, and be themselves Compellers and Threateners, may we not then conclude that they may lawfully interrupt, or at least the other be excused for being interrupted ; where before, in a Subject, it was unlawful to interrupt or let any Parson, in the doing what was by the then Law established ? So that by this very Act (as I conceive) such as have a reverend esteem and willingness to use it, are not only freed *foro interno*, but, by the Clause following, enacting, *That no person shall be at any time hereafter impeached or molested of or for any of the offences abovementioned, hereafter to be committed or done contrary to this Act, unless he or they so offending be thereof indicted at the next General Sessions to be holden before any such Justices of Oyer and Determiner, or Justices of Assise next after any offence committed or done contrary to the tenor of this Act ;* we may conclude he is freed *foro externo* also, and may (for ought I can find) rest free from all danger, while obedient

to the Queens Successory, she dying without an Heir.

35. And if by reason of any Oath or Obligation received at Ordination, or taking degrees, some should think themselves farther bound; They are also to consider, that as neither any derived power can go beyond that which impowers it, so are they also to presume that their intentions are alike; even to maintain Peace and Order, by Uniformity to what is enjoyned, and not to raise disturbance by opposition. And surely, if Oaths, Vows or the like, were to be held of force in such a case; I see not how any Jesuite or Priest could in reason, no nor in Conscience, be perswaded to recede in any thing from their obedience and conformity to the Papall Sea and Ceremony; when as their Promises are not only more strict, but confirmed by Laws more ancient and general, and which are still in the same force.

36. It is also farther to be considered that when after in the Preface to our Bibles it is set down, *That where heretofore there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, some the use of Bangor, some of York, and some of Lincoln; now, from henceforth, all the whole Realm shall have but one use:* And when in the directions following that Preface it is set down; *That all Priests and Deacons should be bound daily to say the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately, or openly, except they be let by preaching, studying of Divinity, or some other urgent cause:* We are still to conceive that both Uniformity was aimed at, and that the duty of Preaching was in the first place held necessary.

37. And if we go to experience, in their practise of this precept of reading of the Service Book, then we shall find it apprehended as an injunction that did onely bind them *ad semper velle*, but not *ad semper agere*, (as Mr. Hooker (elsewhere) speaks of Gods affirmative Precepts, as *Pray continually*, and the like,) and that thereupon few could give account of their daily use of it, even when the hin-

drance of preaching, studying, or the like, could not well be alledged, as before noted. And therefore if in a time when it was commanded, the use of it might be forborn; rather then preaching be omitted, what may we think of them that in a time it is taken away, will yet rather omit preaching then it; to the great discouragement and scandall of many a man in his Christian obedience and Communion, and to the great detriment of the nation in generall: who, in a time of scarcity, are much wanting of that instruction which might be had from men of their abilities. In which respect, as I am my self a true lover of many of them for their learning and gifts in that kinde, so hath the sence of mine own losse, as well as that of others now made me thus large in this particular.

38. But, besides this, and the want of satisfaction how they can in this condition uphold the Church of *England* in her former sentence against non-conformity, if upon the same score they shall slight her authority themselves; They are next to consider, what answer for their present Recusancy they can bring, which on the other side, shall not withall justifie the Recusants themselves in their separation from our Communion also. For plain it is (as I said before) that as the drift of all the arguments brought formerly by the Papists against our Churches authority, was in respect of usurpation in our Princes, and want of succession, lawfull ordination, and the like in our Priests; so was the sum of all their Doctrine that wrote in defence of what was done by us, brought to this issue: That these things were not essentiall to Salvation, or to the being of a Church: That each Christian Church, having (as heretofore set down) a power within it self for ordering its own affairs, had as well power to abbreviate or abrogate what was in former times, or by other Churches instituted before, as to institute that which was new; so that the casting out from our Service Book, and leaving out of our public Forms of Worship, all such Prayers, Ceremonies, and Observations, as in the opinion of those that then had power

power in the Church, had on the one side little or no footing in Scripture, and which had on the other side greatest Superstition cast towards them, was then held lawfull: as by that Declaration annexed to our Bibles, *concerning Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained*, may appear. And if it was then held agreeable, and the Church thought a fit Judge, wherein Superstition was most to be feared, and what was the best way of Reformation; how can we now change our Principle, unlesse we joyn with the adversary to divide the fact, as done by the Civil power, and Magistrate, and with them neither own *England*, for a Church, nor him for head thereof? Let us hear a little what Father *Not* the Jesuite, in his Book called, *Charity maintained*, doth to this purpose alledge, in his answer to Doctor *Potter*; after some dispute, *Chap. 6.* about the truth of our Ministry, for want of Succession visibly derived from the Pope and Church of *Rome*, he saith at last, *Seft. 20.* 'But grant their first Bishops had such Authority from the Church of *Rome*, after the decease of those men, who gave authority to their pretended Successors? The Primate of *England*; but from whom had he such authority? And after his decease, who shall confer authority upon his Successors? The temporall Magistrate: King *Henry*, neither a Catholique, nor a Protestant! King *Edward* a child? Queen *Elizabeth* a woman? an Infant of one houres age, is true King in case of his Predecessors decease: But shall your Church lye fallow till that Infant King, or green head of the Church come to years of discretion? Do your Bishops, your Hierarchy, your succession, your Sacraments, your being, or not being Hereticks, for want of Succession, depend on this new found Supremacy-doctrine, brought in by such a man, meerly upon base occasions, and for shamefull ends; Impugned by *Calvin*, and his followers, derided by the Christian world; and even by chief Protestants, as Doctor *Andrews*, *Watson*, &c. not held any necessary point of Faith? And from whom I pray you, had Bishops their

' authority, when there were no Christian Kings? Must
 ' the Greek Patriarchs receive spiritual jurisdiction from
 ' the Greek *Turk*? Did the Pope by the baptism of
 ' Princes, lose the spiritual power he formerly had of
 ' conferring spiritual jurisdiction upon Bishops? Hath the
 ' Temporal Magistrate authority to preach, to assail from
 ' sins, to inflict Excommunications and other censures?
 ' Why hath he not power to excommunicate, as well as to
 ' dispense in irregularity, as our late Sovereign Lord King
 ' *James* either dispensed with the late Archbishop of *Can-*
 ' *terbury*, or else gave Commission to some Bishops to do
 ' it? And since they were subject to the Primate, and not
 ' he to them, it is cleer that they had no power to dispense
 ' with him, but that power must proceed from the Prince
 ' as superior to them all, and Head in the Protestants
 ' Church in *England*. If he have no such authority, how
 ' can he give to others what himself hath not? Your Ordi-
 ' nation or Consecration of Bishops and Priests imprinting
 ' no character, can only consist in giving a power, autho-
 ' rity, jurisdiction, or (as I said before) Episcopal or Priest-
 ' ly functions: If then the temporal Magistrate confers
 ' this power, &c. he can, nay he cannot chuse but ordain
 ' and consecrate Bishops and Priests, as often as he confers
 ' authority or jurisdiction; and your Bishops, as soon as
 ' they are designed and confirmed by the King, must *ipso*
 ' *facto* be ordained and consecrated by him without inter-
 ' vention of Bishops, or matter and form of Ordination:
 ' Which absurdities you will be more unwilling to grant,
 ' then well able to avoid, if you be true to your own do-
 ' ctrines. The Pope, from whom originally you must beg
 ' your succession of Bishops, never received, nor will, nor
 ' can acknowledg to receive any spiritual jurisdiction from
 ' any temporal Prince: And therefore if jurisdiction must
 ' be derived from Princes, he hath none at all; and yet
 ' either you must acknowledg that he hath spiritual jurif-
 ' diction, or that your selves can receive none from him.
 ' And afterwards again, *sect*, 32. he saith; But besides this
 defect

' defect in the personal succession of Protestant Bishops,
 ' there is another of great moment, which is, that they want
 ' the right form of ordaining Bishops and Priests; because
 ' the manner which they use is so much different from the
 ' Roman Church (at least according to the common opini-
 ' on of Divines) that it cannot be sufficient for the essence
 ' of Ordination, as I could demonstrate if this were the
 ' proper place of such a Treatise, and will not fail to do if
 ' D. Potter give me occasion. In the mean time, the Reader
 ' may be pleased to read the Author cited here in the mar-
 ' gent, and then compare our form of Ordination with that
 ' of Protestants; and to remember, that if the form which
 ' they use either in consecrating Bishops, or in ordaining
 ' Priests, be at least doubtful, they can never have undoubt-
 ' ed Priests nor Bishops: For Priests cannot be ordained
 ' but by true Bishops; nor can any be true Bishop, unless
 ' he be at first Priest. I say, their Ordination is at least
 ' doubtful, because that sufficeth for my present purpose.
 ' For, Bishops and Priests, whose Ordination is notoriously
 ' known to be but doubtful, are not to be esteemed Bishops
 ' or Priests, and no man without sacrilege can receive Sa-
 ' craments from them, all which they administer unlawfully.
 ' And (if we except Baptism with manifest danger of inva-
 ' lidity, and with obligation to be at least conditionally re-
 ' peated) so Protestants must remain doubtful of Remis-
 ' sion of sins, of their Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and may not
 ' pretend to be a true Church, which cannot subsist without
 ' undoubted true Bishops and Priests, nor without due ad-
 ' ministration of Sacraments, which (according to Pro-
 ' testants) is an essential note of the true Church. And it is
 ' a world to observe the proceeding of English Protestants
 ' in this point of their Ordination: For first, *An. 3 Ed. 6.*
 ' *cap. 2.* when he was a Child about twelve years of age, it
 ' was enacted, That such a form of making and consecrating
 ' of Bishops and Priests, as by six Prelates and six other to
 ' be appointed by the King should be devised (Mark well
 ' this word *devised*) and set forth under the Great Seal,
 ' should

should be used, and none other. But after this Act was repealed, 1 *Mar. Sess.* 2. Inſomuch as that when afterwards, *An. 6 & 7 Regin. Eliz.* Biſhop *Bonner* being indiſted upon a Certificate made by Doct^r *Horn* a Pro- teſtant Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, for his reſuſal of the Oath of Supremacie, and excepting againſt the Indiſtment, be- cauſe Dr. *Horn* was no Biſhop; they were all at a ſtand till *An. 8 Eliz. cap. 1.* the Act of *Ed. 6.* was renewed and confirmed, with a particular Proviſo, That no man ſhould be impeached or moleſted by means of any Certificate by any Biſhop or Archbiſhop made before this laſt Act: whereby it is cleer that they made ſome doubt of their own Ordination, and that there is nothing but uncertainty in the whole buſineſs of their Ordination, which (for- ſooth) muſt depend on ſix Prelates, the Great Seal, Acts of Parliament being contrary one to another, and the like. So that you ſee all along the authority and interpoſition of the Magiſtrate is ſcoſſed at, and by them made ineffectual in the ordering of the affairs of the Church; nay the Church muſt be no Church, if not wholly and independently governed by the Clergy, and a Clergy too that do particularly derive their Ordination and power from a forein Head, and according to Rights and Ceremonies then aboliſhed. If none but true Priests can adminiſter the Sacraments, nor none but true Biſhops make true Priests, nor none but the Pope make true Biſhops, (but that the authority of the Magiſtrate doth interpoſe) why then no true Sacraments, nor no true Church, by their doctrine. And to that purpoſe he doth put a *mark* upon the word *deviſed*, as deriding the Civil power therein:

38. If we ſhall add to this what was (before him) ob- ſerved by Father *Parſons* concerning the inſtitution of the Service-book, and objected againſt the validity and uſe of it, as well as the power to aboliſh their Maſs and other Ceremonies; it will make us wary in condemning leſs Alterations now made by a greater Power, while yet we ſhall commend conformity to a leſs Power, in a matter of
greater

greater alteration. For he alleadgeth in his Book of the *Three Conversions of England*, par. 2. chap. 12. sect. 25. That the Reformation and Service-book were made by the then *Protector* to *Edward* the sixth, (who it is well known had no such power and sovereignty in himself as our present *Protector* hath.) And to this end he saith: 'And now
' Candles, Ashes, and Images being gone (as you see)
' there followed in the next moneth after (to wit, *March*)
' that the *Protector* still desiring to go forward with his designment of alteration, sent abroad a Proclamation in the
' Kings name, with a certain Communion-book in English,
' to be used for administration of Sacraments in stead of
' the Mass-book. But whether it was the very same that
' was rejected a little before in the Parliament, or another
' patched up afterward, or the same mended or altered, is
' not so cleer. But great care there was had by the *Protector* and his adherents, that this Book should be admitted and put in practice presently, even before it was allowed in Parliament. To which effect *Fox* setteth down a
' large Letter of the Council to all Bishops, exhorting and
' commanding them, in the Kings name, to admit and put
' in practice this Book. *We have thought good* (say they)
' to pray and require your Lordships, and nevertheless in the
' Kings Majesties our most dread Lords name to command
' you, to have a diligent, earnest and careful respect to cause
' these Books to be delivered to every Parson, Vicar and Curate within your Diocese, with such diligence, as they may
' have sufficient time well to instruct and advise themselves
' for the distribution of the most holy Communion, according
' to the Order of this Book, before this Easter time, &c.
' praying you to consider, that this Order is set forth to the intent there should be in all parts of the Realm one uniform
' manner quietly used. To the execution whereof we do estoons require you to have a diligent respect, as you tender
' the Kings Majesties pleasure, and will answer to the contrary, &c. From *Westminster*, the 13. of *March*, 1548.
' By all which, and by much more that might be alleadged,

it is evident, that all that was hitherto done against Catholick Religion for these first two years, until the second Parliament, was done by private authority of the Protector and his adherents, before Law, and against Law, &c.

40. And if we look farther into the Preamble of the first Statute that confirmed this Book, by him also set down a little after, *sect. 35.* we may find that the said Book was appointed first for Uniformity; and next, that it or some other had been set on foot before by the Lord Protector in the Kings name. The words are; *Where of long time (saith the Act) there hath been in this Realm of England divers Forms of Common-Prayer, commonly called the Service of the Church, as well concerning Mattens and Evensong, as also the whole Communion called the Mass, &c. And where the Kings Majesty, with the advice of his most entirely beloved Uncle the Lord Protector, and others of his Highness Council, hath heretofore divers times assayed to stay Innovations or new Rites concerning the premisses; yet the same hath not had such good success as his Highness required in that behalf. Whereupon his Highness by the most prudent advice aforesaid, being pleased to bear with the frailty and weakness of his Subjects in that behalf, of his great clemencie hath not been only content to abstain from punishment in that behalf; but also to the intent that an uniform, quiet, and godly order should be had concerning the premisses, hath appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury and certain of the most learned and discreet Bishops, to consider and ponder the premisses; and thereupon having as well an eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian Religion taught by the Scriptures, as the usages of the Primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient and meet order, rite and fashion of Common-Prayer and administration of Sacraments to be used in England, Wales, &c. The which at this time by the aid of the Holy Ghost, with uniform agreement, is of them concluded, set forth and delivered, to his Highness great comfort and quietness of mind, in a Book entituled, The Book of Common-Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, &c.*

Now

Now truly I cannot, for my part, see how we can make either the first Imposition or receipt of this Book lawfull if we stick not to our main principle in acknowledging the present supream Christian Magistrate to be head of the Church, which doubtless the Protector was in the non-age of the King. And if those elder Reformed Protestants amongst us, did well to conform to this authority in abolition of the Masse, and other very ancient services, and that notwithstanding the Book had been by Parliament already rejected, there seems to me great reason to conform to what an Act of Parliament and a Protector of more power, hath determined concerning another alteration of this kinde. To think that the Book, or the Ceremonies thereby appointed, had of themselves, (separate from that Authority, by which they were devised and imposed) any such inherent and divine worth, as for their own sake to claim admittance and continuance, were plainly to contradict the act it self, and the Stories of those times which tell us by whom it was made, and by whom commanded, and it doth plainly cross the judgement of Mr. Hooker himself, who in his answer to Mr. Travers, fol. 471. may be found giving sentence for indifferency in the use of these things as in themselves, by the instance of kneeling, sitting, or walking, at receiving of Sacraments; his words are ,
 ' An order as I learn, there was tendred, that Communicants
 ' should neither kneel, as in the most places of the Realm :
 ' nor sit as in this place the custome is, but walk to the one
 ' side of the Table, and there standing till they had received, passe afterwards away round about by the other ;
 ' which being on a sudden begun to be practised in the
 ' Church, some sat wondring what it should mean, others
 ' deliberating what to do, till such time, as at length by
 ' name one of them being called openly thereunto, requested that they might do as they had been accustomed,
 ' which was granted, and as Master Travers had administered his way to the rest ; so a Curate was sent to minister
 ' to them after their way; which unprosperous beginning

‘of a thing, (*saving onely for the inconvenience of needles alterations, otherwise harmles*) did so disgrace that order in their conceit who had to allow or disallow it, that it took no place. Was there indifferency and harmlesness in the use of these things then, and ~~now~~ they onely inconvenient, as causing distraction and scandall to the generality of other receivers; and could Master Hooker record without censure, the custome of that Congregation whereof he was Minister; in receiving of the Communion sitting, (and for ought appears gave it so to them himself) whereas yet the Service Book had appointed it kneeling; and shall we now think of any inherent divine wor^{sh}ip in the things themselves? No sure, this would but too plainly argue them guilty of Superstition that so maintain, and thereupon render the abolition of it both just and reasonable. Now, as the abolition of the Masse Book was formerly in respect of like superstition cast towards it: For the late Archbishop, *sect. 35. num. 7. punct. 5.* affirmeth, that *himself had heard some Jesuites confess that in the Lyrurgie of the Church of England there is no positive Error: And being pressed why then they refused to come to our Churches, and serve God with us.* (In like manner as now Conformists may be asked, now when no positive error can be objected neither) *They answered (saith he) they could not do it; because though our Liturgy had nothing ill, yet it wanted a great deal of that which was good, and was in their Service: So that if this answer were not valuable to excuse Refusants then, I see not how the like can excuse any now.*

41. All which well weighed, I know no effectuall answer to be made to such as have been Recusants or Non-conformists, if we fall from that principle of acknowledgement of that Supremacy which the Church then gave the chief Magistrate amongst us, accounting him *in all causes, and over all Persons, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil, supream Head and Governour.* If upon any pretence we forsake this hold, we not only lose the direct way to unity and peace, but do let in error on every side to over master and confound us. And
although

although this power were formerly given to the chief Magistrate while they had the stile of King or Queen, yet if we shall impartially consider the intention of that Act whereby this power was exercised by the King, we shall finde that it, like all Laws, having a regard to the perpetuall conservation of Peace, Order, and Unity, did not limit it to persons so stiled onely, but that it might be kept for ever, did for ever unite it to the *Imperial Crown of this Realm*; that is, to the Monarch thereof, although no King, nor more crowned, nor anointed then some of the Roman Emperors were; and accordingly we shall find Mr. Hooker to understand and apply it; for reckoning up the Subject whereof his eight Books are to treat, He saith, *The eight is; of the power of Ecclesiastical dominion or Supream Authority, which with us, the highest Governour or Prince, hath as well in respect of domestical jurisdictions, as of that other forrainly claimed by the Bishop of Rome.* In which expressions of *Highest Governour or Prince* (Prince signifying the same with *Highest Governour, or Governour in chief*.) we may presume he meant it due to the King as Monarch, and not to the Monarch as King. And a great pittie it is that we had not the Book it self to have been further satisfied herein, and in the power belonging to him: But for want thereof, we will adde the judgement of such others as have been generally held most famous in their generations.

42. Bishop Andrews in his Sermon upon that Text of *Touch not mine annointed*, proves at large that all persons in Supream Power are to be esteemed Gods annointed, although material Unction and other Ceremonies be wanting; as primarily (he saith) 'It was meant of such as were Patriarchs; For (saith he) fol 798. in the first World the Patriarchs were principal persons, and (as I may safely say) Princes in their generations, and for such holden and reputed by those with whom they lived. I may safely say it, for of Abraham it is in expresse terms said by the Hethites, *Audi Domine, Princeps Dei es inter nos*, Thou art a Prince

* of God (*that is, a mighty Prince*) *here among us* : As in-
 * deed a Prince he shewed himself, when he gave battel and
 * overthrow to four Kings at once. Of *Isaac* no less may
 * be said; who grew so mighty, as the King of *Palestine*
 * was glad to intreat him to remove further off, and not
 * dwell so neer him; and then to go after him in person
 * and sue to him, there might be a league of amity between
 * them. And the like of *Jacob*, who by his sword and bow
 * conquered from the *Amorite* (the mightiest of all the
 * Nations in *Canaan*) that Country, which by will he gave
 * to *Joseph* for possession. It was neer to *Sichar*, well known;
 * you have mention of it, *Job. 4. 5*:

* Great men they were, certainly greater then most
 * conceive. But be their greatness what it will, this is sure,
 * they were all the Rulers the people of God then had,
 * and besides them Rulers had they none. And that is it
 * we seek: *Pater* was in them, and *agn* too; Fatherhood
 * and Government: And these two made them Patriarchs,
 * & *unctas ante unctionem* (saith *S. Augustine*) anointed
 * before there was any material anointing at all. And as
 * he said it to be properly due to such, and none but such as
 * were Rulers of the people of God; so because Christian
 * Magistracie in the latter ages was mostly executed by and
 * under the notion of Kings, so doth he afterwards prove
 * how they were to succeed in this right. Which done, he
 * proceeds to censure that usurpation of power foreignly
 * claimed by Pope and Cardinals, who under pretence of
 * this title would enter common with Christian Kings;
 * proving that thirty three times in Scripture the terms of
 * Gods anointed are used, and no where to be applied to any
 * but Patriarchs, Christ himself, or of Kings all: shewing
 * farther, that others, Priests, Prophets, or the like, although
 * they were anointed, and might be so called. yet were never
 * stiled, the Lords anointed; it may be *uncti*, but not *Christi*.
 * And then setting forth the Kings more proper claim to
 * this title, as being chief Christian head, he after asks, *Who*
be they? If we go by the book, *Princes*: why then, touch not
 Princes,

Princes, that is, such as are in principal power, or Rulers in chief And thereupon he after adds, to take their supposition off that thought this Authority depended on the Ceremony of Uction, or the like, fol. 800. ' This claim by the Ceremony is clean marred by this Text: For when these words (here, were spoken, there was no such Ceremony instituted, it was *non ens*, no such thing in *rerum natura*; that name not up til *Moses*. Now these here in the Text were in their graves long before *Moses* was born; no *meos* then, no claim by the Ceremony. And after it came up, no Priest went out of *Italy* to *Persia* to carry the Ceremony to *Cyrus*; yet of him saith *Isaiah*, *Hac dicit Dominus Cyro Christo meo*, Thus saith the Lord to *Cyrus* mine anointed: And yet never came there any oil upon his head. So that even after it was taken up, yet the Ceremony and the claim by it, would not hold. The truth is, the Ceremony doth not any thing; onely declareth what is done. The party was before, as much as he is after it: Onely by it is declared to be, that he was before, and the which he should have been still; though he had never so been declared. The truth may and doth subsist, as with the Ceremony, so without it. It may be retained, as with some it is, and with us it is, and it may be spared as it is with others; spared or retained, all is one; no claim groweth that way. But last of all, where it was used, as by *Samuel* to *Saul*, by *Zadoc* to *Solomon*: yet they claimed nothing in the parties they anointed, but called them still Gods, and never their own anointed: They knew no claim lay by it. Nay, if it had been a Sacrament, as it was but a Ceremony: he that ministrerh the Sacrament, hath no interest in the party by it, but God alone; and then much lesse he that performeth but a Ceremony, is to plead any *meos*. So that every way, this claim vanisheth of *Christi Pontificis*.

Afterwards he reproves all claim made by the people of power over them, as though they were their anointed, or had his right to govern from their suffrages: And sets forth.

forth also by divers instances of personal failings, both in Government and Religion, as well among the Roman Emperors as others, that no such pretence of fault could debar the person; him that was in power, of this priviledg and title, so as to give liberty of touching him either with hand, tongue, or pen, or the like: For (saith he) *It is the administration to govern, not the gift to govern well; the right of ruling not the ruling right: It includes nothing but a due Title; it excludes nothing but Usurpation.* And he asks the question, *who is anointed?* and answers it, *on whom the right rests:* And so again he asketh, *Who is inunctus?* and answers, *He that hath it not,* that is (as I conceive) hath not this right *by administration to govern,* or immediate possession of the Government. If he be a Foreigner, like the Pope, he is to be accounted an Usurper, as meddling in anothers mans jurisdiction. Or if he be (as he after instanceth) in *Nimrod*, *one who cared for no anointing, thrust himself in, and by violence usurped the throne, came in rather like one steeped in vinegar, then anointed with oil, rather as a Ranger of a Forrest; then a Father of a family; he was no anointed, nor any that so cometh in.* These words at first view will seem to a prejudiced Reader to contradict and overthrow all said before in defence of the authority and respect to be given to the chief Magistrate: but when we shall have considered those qualifications that debar him this anointing, and then whether it abate Subjects in their just obedience, or him only in having just title to it; and then whether this repulse and resistance of such an one may be made whilst he is first entring, or afterwards also, and by whom then made; we may then well reconcile him to what was said before. For first having spoken of that sacred power which belongs to each Christian King as anointed, he was to oppose to it all foreign claim, whether craftily entred upon, as the Pope mentioned before, or forcibly, as now instanced in *Nimrod*; especially if a Heathen, or of another Religion; in which respect he could not be reckoned among the *Christi*, not caring for anointing, or to have care of Church or Religion,

on, which is the drift of this Discourse. When as, if we should understand that every one that a discontented party will call Usurpers, or do make a forcible entry, may be, by those that live under his obeisance, withstood upon any allegation, we make him contradict himself, in commending that submission which Primitive Christians gave to their former Emperors, although known Usurpers, and some of them different in Religion.

43. But he will be best understood to gainsay such kind of Liberty or meaning, by the immediate following words. *But on the other side, David, or he that beginneth a royal race, is as the Head; on him is that right of ruling first shed, from him it runs down to the next, and so still, even to the lowest border of his issue.*) so that then you finde that it is not that which now is usually called Usurpation; the possession of the government by a new Person, or Family, that is Usurpation indeed; for how then should any amongst Christians be thought a lawfull *beginner of a Royal Race*, who in his possession must needs dispossess some person of the old family which could never be supposed to want some such relating to him in kindred, as to be apparantly within the *lowest borders of this natural Issue*, as he said before? And if he did do so as *David* did to the family of *Saul*, and have not the like Divine anointing and warrant as he had; how shall Subjects be so guided in their distinction as not mistake and think every one a Usurper? For if such an one be a Usurper, then are Christian Kingdoms governed by a race of Usurpers. Nay by Usurpers too, if (as he saith) right be to be derived from the first beginner of a Race.

44. And it is also to be noted, that this derivation of right from first seizure, as though his right were best, even as *David's* was better then any that followed, doth contradict that fancy of prescription, as meer fancy indeed; wherein it is made worst: or rather to have no worth at all, but that the Successors do arrive at Lawfulness, according as by degrees they shall be removed from it.

45. And to prove his meaning to be that Subjects may
not

Not upon any such Allegation rise or resist, we shall finde
 him instancing in the case of *Saul*, of whom he saith,
fol. 791. 'I verily think God, in this first example, of his
 'first King over his own people, hath purposely suffered
 'them all to fall out, and to be found in him; even all that
 'should fall out in any King after him, to enforce their Po-
 'sition: that so we might find them answered to our hands.
 'To touch them in Order; they would easily have quar-
 'relled at *Saul's* mis-government. Not at the first; he then
 'was a mild and a gracious Prince. Never came there from
 'any Princes mouth, a more princely speech, then the first
 'speech he is recorded to have spoken, *Quid populo, quod*
 '*flet? what ailes the people to complain?* A speech worthy
 'everlasting memory, so they complain not without cause.
 'But within a while, he grew so stern and fierce, as no man
 'might speak to him. Upon every light occasion, nay,
 'upon no occasion at all, his Javelin went straight to nail
 'men to the wall; not *David* onely, but *Jonathan* his Son
 'and Heir apparant, and no cause why. In the 13. Chap-
 'ter it is said, *Saul* had then been King a yeer, and reigned
 'two years in *Israel*; yet it is well known, his reign was
 'fourty years: Their own Writers resolve it thus, how
 'long soever he reigned, he was a King but two years. All
 'the time after, he was somewhat else, or somewhat more
 'then a King. And they let not to tell what; applying to
 'Saul that of the Psalm, *Tyrants that have not God before*
 '*their eyes seek after my soul.* And that, *Under thy wings shall*
 '*be my refuge, till this tyranny be overpast;* Yet for all this
 'Tyranny, *ne perdas*, saith *David*, yet for all this he fell not
 'into the sin of all sins, which they stand so much on *usur-*
 '*ping power in things spirituall;* Yes, and that would they
 'have found too. Why? did he call himself *Head of the*
 '*Church?* Indeed no, *Samuel* did that for him; He it was
 'that said, *When thou wert little in thine own eyes, the Lord*
 '*made thee Head of the Tribes of Israel,* (of which the Tribe
 'of *Levi* was one) for that *Samuel* must answer. But *Saul*
 'went further a great deal; yea further then *Oza*: For he
 'took

' took upon him to sacrifice in person himself; to offer
 ' burnt offerings upon the very Altar, the Highest part
 ' of all the Priests Office: that is, usurped further then e-
 ' ver did any. And all this *David* knew, yet it kept him
 ' not from saying, *ne perdas*. They never have done with
 ' persecuting and shedding Priests blood: was *Sauls* sing-
 ' er in that too? In that he passed: He put the *Highb*
 ' *Priest* himself, and fourscore and four more all in one day
 ' to the sword, and all upon the single accusation of *Doreg*;
 ' Innocent in the fact, and all Loyall to him, and all but
 ' for a douzen of bread given to *David*. This could not
 ' but grieve *David* exceedingly: it was for his sake; yet he
 ' saith, *ne perdas*, though for all that. And one case more
 ' I give in for advantage. It is well known he was a *Demo-*
 ' *niack*, one actually possessed with an *evill Spirit*; which
 ' is a case beyond all other cases: yet destroy him not, *Abi-*
 ' *sai*, though: So that, if *Abisai*, in stead of *Inimicum*
 ' *tuum*, had said, *God hath shut up this Tyrant, this Usurper,*
 ' *this Persecutor, this possessed party, this what you will;*
 ' *David* would have said no other then he did, *ne perdas*,
 ' still. I would fain know, which of all their destructive
 ' cases is here wanting: They be all here, all in *Saul*, all
 ' in him at the time of this motion: yet all alter not the
 ' case; *David* saith still, as he said. If then all be in *Saul*,
 ' all incident, all eminent in him, nay if his case be beyond
 ' all said it must be, that *David* here saith. Though he be
 ' any of these, though he be all these, *destroy him not; or*
 ' *destroy him, and be destroyed; destroy him, and be the child*
 ' *of perdition*.

' I would be loth to deceive you; There may seem yet to
 ' want one thing. Here was no *High Priest*, to excommu-
 ' nicate him, or give warrant to do it; yes, that there was
 ' too, for *Abiathar* escaped that great Massacre of Priests
 ' by *Saul*; and now he was lawfull *High Priest*. Now he
 ' fled to *David* thence, and brought the Ephod with him.
 ' So as by good hap, the *High Priest* was with *David* now
 ' in the Camp, and the Ephod too. There wanted no just

'cause (you see) to proceed against *Saul*. There wanted
 'no lawfull Authority, the *High Priest* we have: There
 'wanted no good will in *Abiathar*, ye may be sure, his
 'father and brethren having been murdered by *Saul*, so
 'here was all, or might have been, for a word speaking,
 'all would not serve; *David* is still where he was; saith
 'still, *ne perdas*; knew no such power in the *High Priests*
 'censure, was not willing to abuse it, cannot see *Quis*, any
 'person to do it; nor any cause for which it is to be done.
 'That *Abisai* may not do it, nor *Abiathar* give warrant to
 'it, his charge is honest, *ne perdas*: His reason good, *Chri-*
 '*stus Domini*; His sentence just, nor *erit insons*: His chal-
 'lenge unanswerable, *quis mittet manum*.

46. By giving Subjects leave to rise and resist in such a
 case, would also be the ready way to bring the Church and
 State into such a condition as to have *no King in Israel*, and
 so bring in Idolatry and Anarchy; which in his Sermon
 upon that Text, he imputes to that want; and therefore
fol. 126. saith, 'Our first thanks then shall be this first,
 'the ground of all the rest, for a King. This very thing
 'that there is one and that this defect *Non erat Rex*, hath
 'not taken hold on us. The shout of a King is a joyfull
 'shout, was a true saying out of the mouth of a false
 'Prophet, (*Balaam*) but forced thereto by God; That a
 'joyfull shout, and this a wofull cry, *Hof 10 3. Nonne ideo*
 '*nobis nullus Rex, quia non timemus Dominum*. Are we not
 'therefore without a King because we fear not God? And
 'our fear to God was not such, but he might justly have
 'brought us to the miserable plight. The more cause
 'have we to thank him, that we have one. And when I say
 'one, I mean first any one; for be he *Nebuchadonosor*, yet
 'must we pray for him: Or be it *Jeroboam* him though
 'God gave in his wrath, yet he took away in his fury, the
 'worse wrath of the twain. Or be he who he will, to have
 'one, is a matter of thanksgiving; for better any, then an
 'Anarchy: Better any one a King, then every one a King;
 'and every one is more then a King if he do what he lists:

{ It

'It calleth to mind the cry of the Beasts in the Fable, when
'they were in consultation to submit themselves to the
'Lion as to their King: For when it was alleadged, it was
'like enough he would do they knew not well what, what
'he listed, which they had cause to fear; they all cryed,
'*Præstat unum timere quàm multos*, Better one Lion do so,
'then all the Bears and Wolves and wild Beasts of the For-
'rest, as before they did. First then for this, that there is
'any King, &c.

47. And therefore in sum, in what he speaks against
Uurpation, he must be also understood as all others in that
kind; that is, striving to cast what *odium* he can upon it,
that ambitious persons might be more discouraged from
such undertakings; and not as meaning that Subjects have
right to rise or resist, upon any pretence of civil or legal
right, him whom Divine Providence hath at any time
brought in for to be Head of the Church. And this espe-
cially, if they find in this man all that can be expected in
him that beginneth a Royal race; that is, both Election and
Conquest, like as in *David*. He is not, like *Nimrod*, a
stranger by birth and relation, found to force himself in by
his own greatness and power, but being of the same Nation
and Religion, is at first freely chosen and followed, and
that by a more numerous and eminent party then that
which *David* first headed. During which time he was also
undeniably signal in those victories he obtained over such
as were their enemies; by which he might come to claim
right and dominion over them, even as by election he might
claim it over the other of his own party, and so have just
dominion over all. For it is a gross mistake to think, that
either Election or Conquest (the two ways to transfer right
in this kind) can be otherwise, or more truly had. For first,
if none could be thought duly elected, but where every man
in all parties did personally agree, or might be concluded to
do so; this were impossible. Nay, such confirmation were
not to be expected, nor was ever had, although that Nation
or Kingdom were not divided into parties: But these that

had the ruling power in a Nation, or party thereof, having chosen their Head, all that do then, or shall come to submit to them, must be taken as submitting to their choice also. And then, as no one man can be elected by every one, so can no one be supposed able to conquer every one, whereby to give him right to govern that way neither. He must not be supposed Conqueror of his friends and those of his own party; but having had right of dominion of them by election, he hath also, as their Head, right of headship over those they shall afterward conquer. But of this more anon.

48. I shall now proceed to shew what was the judgment of this learned Bishop concerning the Power of this Head of the Church, and particularly in calling Councils, or the like: And how he argues, that the right to call the Assemblies belonged to the Magistrate in chief, even as such. We shall find that, in that Sermon made *Of the right and power of calling Assemblies*, he proves, that by the two Trumpets delivered to Moses, the ordering of Church-assemblies, implied by one, is as well intrusted as the other. For, saith he, (fol 202.) If these be needful for the Camp, and for the Congregation, as it is a Civil body; I doubt not but I may add also, every way as needful for the Congregation properly so called, (that is) the Church. The Church hath her wars to fight, the Church hath her laws to make: Wars with Heresies, wherein experience teacheth it is a matter of less difficulty to raze a good Fort, then to cast down a strong imagination; and more easie to drive out of the Field a good Army of men, then to chase out of mens minds a heap of fond opinions, having once taken head. Now Heresies have ever been best put to flight by the Churches assemblies, (that is) Councils, as it were by Armies of Gods Angels, (as *Ensebin* calleth them:) yea, it is well known, some Heresies could never be thoroughly mastered but so. Then for the Churches Laws (which we call Canons and Rules) made to restrain or redress abuses, they have always likewise been made at her Assemblies,
in

In councils, and not elsewhere. So that as requisite are Assemblies for the Congregation in this sense, as in any other.

By this then that hath been said it appeareth, that Gods *fac tibi* here, is no more then needs; but that meet it is the Trumpets be put to making. And so I pass over to the Instruments, which is the second part. Assemblies (we said) is reduced to motion; Motion is a work of Power; Power is executed *organice*, (that is) by Instrument: So that an Instrument we must have, wherewithal to stir up or begin this motion. That Instrument to be the Trumpet. It is the sound that God himself made choice to use at the publishing or proclaiming his Law; and the same sound he will have continued and used for Assemblies which are (as hath been said) special supporters of his Law; and the very same he will use too at the last, when he will take account of the keeping or breaking of it, which shall be done *in tuba novissima*, by the sound of the last trump. And he holdeth one, or continueth one and the same Instrument, to shew it is one and the same Power that continueth still: That whether an Angel blow it, as at *Sinai*; or whether *Moses*, as ever after, it is one sound, even Gods sound, Gods voice we hear in both. They are to be twain for the two Assemblies; that follows in the next verses: Either of the whole Tribes, *coagmentive*, or of the chief and choice persons of them, *representative*. And for the two Tables also: For even this very moneth, the first day, they are used to a civil end; the tenth day to a holy, for the day of expiation; of which this latter belongeth to the first, that former to the second Table. They are to be of silver (not to seek after speculations) only for the metals sake, which hath the shrillest and clearest sound of all others. They are to be of one whole piece both of them, not of two divers; and that must needs have a meaning, it cannot be for nothing: For unless it were of some meaning, what skilled it else though they had been made of two several plates? but only

only to shew that both Assemblies are *unius jure*, both
 of one and the same right, as the Trumpets are wrought
 and beaten out both of one entire peece of bullion. But
 it will be to small purpose to stand much upon the Instru-
 ment: I make way therefore to the third point, how they
 shall be bestowed, who shall have the dealing with them;
 for on them depends, and with them goeth the power of
 calling Assemblies. First, to whom these Trumpets, to
 whom this power was granted to call the Congregation:
 And then whether the Congregation were ever after so
 called by this power, and these Trumpets. Where first it
 will be soon agreed (I trust) that every body must not be
 allowed to be a Maker of Trumpets; nor when they be
 made, that they hang where who that list may blow them:
 That is, that every mans hand over head, is not to be in
 case to draw multitudes together. There will be (saith
 Saint Luke) *Turbatio non minima*, no small ado, if that
 may be suffered. If *Demetrius* getting together his fellow-
Craftsmen, they may of their own heads rush into the
 Common-Hall, and there keep a shouting and crying two
 hours together, not knowing most of them why they came
 thither, and yet thither they came: There is not so much
 good in publique meetings, but there is thrice as much
 hurt in such as this: No Commonwealth, no, not popular
 Estates could ever endure them. Nay, *πάντα κατὰ τὸ ἔξι*,
 (say both Scripture and Nature) *Let all be done in order*:
 Let us have *ἐννομὸν ἐκκλησίαν*, lawful orderly Assemblies,
 or else none at all. Away then with this Confusion (to
 begin with;) Away with *Demetrius's* Assemblies. To
 avoid then this confusion, some must have this power,
 for and in the name of the rest. Shall it be one, or more?
 (for that is next.) Nay, but one (saith God) in saying,
ibi. Where I wish you mark this: That as at the first
 he took this power into his own hands, and called them
 still together himself: So here he deriveth this power
 immediately from himself, unto one, without first setting
 it in any body collective at all.

It is from our purpose to enter the question, Whether the power were in the whole body originally? Seeing, though it were, it is now by the positive ordinance of God otherwise disposed. The reason may seem to be, partly necessity of expedition; the Trumpets may need to be blown sometimes suddenly, sooner then divers can well meet, and agree upon it too. Partly avoiding of distraction: The two Trumpets may be blown two divers ways, if they be in two hands, and so shall the Trumpet give an uncertain sound, (1 Cor. 14:8.) and how shall the Congregation know whither to assemble? Nay (a worse matter yet then all that) so may we have Assembly against Assembly; and rather then so, better no Assembly at all. Therefore, as God would have them both made of one piece, so will he have them both made over to one person; for. [*Tibi*] implieth one. Who is that one? It is to Moses God speaketh; to him is this *Tibi* directed: Him doth God nominate, and of his person make choice first to make these Trumpets; no man to make, no man to have the hammering of any Trumpet but he. And there is no question, but for Aaron and his sons the Priests, they are to call the Levites, to call the people together to their Assemblies: How shall they warn them together, unless they make a Trumpet too? But if there be any question about this, Gods proceeding here will put all out of question: For to whom giveth he this charge? Not to Aaron is this spoken, but to Moses: Aaron receiveth no charge to make any Trumpet; never a *fac tibi* to him, neither in this, nor in any other place. To Moses is this charge given: And to Moses, not, Make thee one, (one for secular affairs, that they would allow him) but *fac tibi duas*, Make thee two, make both. Well, the making is not it: One may make, and another may have: *Sic vos non vobis* — You know the old Verse. When they be made and done, then who shall owe them? It is expressed that too; *Et erunt tibi*, They shall be for thee. They shall be, not one for thee, and another for Aaron; but

but, *Erunt tibi* They shall be both for thee, they shall be both thine. A third if they can find, they may claim to that: But both these are for *Moses*. We have then the delivery of them to *Moses* to make, which is a kind of Seisin, or a Ceremony investing him with the right of them. We have beside plain words to lead their possession; and those words operative, *Erunt tibi*: That as none to make them, so none to own them being made, but *Moses*. And what would we have more to shew us, *Cujus sunt tuba*, whose the Trumpets be, or whose is the right of calling Assemblies? It is *Moses* certainly, and he by vertue of these stands seised of it.

To go yet further: But was not all this to *Moses* for his time only; and as it begun in him, so to take end with him? Was it not one of the same *privilegia personalia, qua non trahuntur in exemplum*. A priviledg peculiar to him, and so no precedent to be made of it? No, for if you look a little forward (to the 8. verse following) there you shall see, that this power which God here conveyeth, this Law of the Silver-trumpet, is a Law to last for ever, even throughout all their generations, not that generation only. And there is great reason it should be so, that seeing the use should never cease the power likewise should never determine. Being then not to determine, but to continue, it must descend to those that hold *Moses* place. I demand then, what place did *Moses* hold? Sure it is that *Aaron* was now the High Priest, anointed and fully invested in all the rights of it, ever since the eight Chapter of the last Book. *Moses* had in him now no other right but that of the chief Magistrate: Therefore as in that right (and no other) he received and he'd them: So; he was made *Custos utriusque Tabula*: So, he was made *Custos utriusque Tuba*. But who can tell us better then he himself in what right he held them? He doth it in the third verse of *Deut. 33*. (read it which way you will.) *Frat in Jeshurun Rex*, or. *in rectissimo Rex*; or, *in rectitudine Rex*; or, *in recto Regis, dum congregares Principes*

Principes populi, & Tribus Israel. All come to this; that though in strict propriety of speech *Moses* were no King, yet in this he was in *rectitudine Rex*, or in *recto Regis*, (that is) in this, had (as we say) *jus Regale*, that he might and did assemble the Tribes, and chief men of the Tribes at his pleasure. Herein he was *Rex in certitudine*; for this was *rectitudo Regis*, a power Regal. And so it was held in *Egypt* before *Moses*, even in the Law of Nature, that without *Pharaoh* no man might lift up hand or foot in all the Land of *Egypt*, (suppose to no publique or principal motion.) And so hath it been holden in all Nations, as a special power belonging to dominion. Which maketh it seem strange, that those men which in no cause are so fervent, as when they plead, that Church-men should not *reverti*, that is, have dominion; do yet hold this power, which hath ever been reputed most proper to dominion, should belong to none but to them only. Our Saviour *Christus Vos autem non sic*, may (I am sure) be said to them here in a truer sense, then as they commonly use to apply it. To conclude then this point: If *Moses*, as in the right of chief Magistrate held this power, it was from him to descend to the chief Magistrates after him over the people of God, and they to succeed him, as in his place, so in this right; it being by God himself settled in *Moses*, and annexed to his place *lege perpetua*, by an Estate indefeisible, by a perpetual Law throughout all their generations. Therefore ever after by Gods express order, from year to year, every year, on the first day of the seventh moneth, were they blown by *Moses* first, and after by them that held his place, and the feast of the Trumpets solemnly holden; as to put them in mind of the benefit thereby coming to them, so withall to keep alive and fresh still in the knowledg of all, that this power belonged to their place, that so none might ever be ignorant to whom it did of right appertain to call Assemblies. And how then shall *Aarons* Assemblies be called? with what Trumpet they? God himself hath provided for that in the tenth

verse following, that with no other then these. (There is in all the Law no order for calling an Assembly, to what end, or for what cause soever, but this, and only this: no order for making any third Trumpet; under these two therefore all are comprised.) This order there God taketh, that *Moses* shall permit *Aarons* sons to have the use of these Trumpets; but the use, not the property. They must take them from *Moses*, as (in the 31. Chapter of this Book *Phineas* doth) But *Erunt tibi*, Gods own words, *Erunt tibi* must still be remembered: His they be, for all that; *Moses* the owner still, the right remains in him; their sounding of them deprives not him of his interest, alters not the property: *Erunt tibi* must still be true, that right must still be preserved. It may be, if we communicate with flesh and blood, we may think it more convenient (as some do) that God had delivered *Moses* and *Aaron* either of them one: But when we see Gods will by Gods word what it is, that *Moses* is to have them both; we will let that pass as a revelation of flesh and blood, and think that which God thinketh to be most convenient.

Now then, if the Trumpets belong to *Moses*, and that to this end, that with them he may call the Congregation, these two things do follow. First, that if he call, the Congregation must not refuse to come. Secondly, that unless he call, they must not assemble of their own heads, but keep their places. Briefly thus: The Congregation must come when it is called, and it must be called ere it come. These are the two duties we owe to the two Trumpets; and both these have Gods people ever performed. And yet not so, but that this right hath been called in question, yea even in *Moses* own time, (that we marvel not if it be so now) and both these duties denied him, even by those who were alive and present then when God gave him the Trumpets. But mark by whom, and what became of them. The first duty is, to come when they be called; and this was denied (in the 16 Chapter following, ver. 12.)
by

by *Core*, *Dathan*, and their Crew : *Moses* founded his Trumpet, sent to call them ; they answer flatly, (and that not once, but once and again) *Non venimus*, they would not come, not once stir for him or his Trumpet, they. A plain contradiction indeed ; neither is there in all that Chapter any contradiction *veri nominis*, truly and properly so to be called, but only that. You know what became of them ; they went quick to hell for it : And wo be to them even under the Gospel (saith Saint *Jude*) that perish in the same contradiction, the contradiction of *Core*. The second duty is, To be called ere they come. This likewise denied even *Moses* himself, (that they in his place might not think strange of it) in the 20 Chapter of this very Book. Water waxing scant, a company of them grew mutinous, and in tumultuous manner, without any sound of the Trumpet, assembled of themselves. But these are branded too ; the water they got, is called the water of *Meriba* : And what followed, you know ; none of them that drunk of it, came into the Land of Promise ; God swore they should not enter into his rest. Now, as both these are bad ; so of the twain this latter is the worse. The former (that came not, being called) do but sit still, as if they were somewhat thick of hearing : But these latter (that come, being not called) either they make themselves a Trumpet, without ever a *fac ribi* ; or else they offer to wring *Moses's* Trumpet out of his hands, and take it into their own : Take heed of this latter : It is said there to be *adversus Mosén*, even against *Moses* himself. It is the very next forerunner to it, it pricks fast upon it : For they that meet against *Moses's* will, when they have once thoroughly learned that lesson, will quickly perhaps grow capable of another, even to meet against *Moses* himself, as these did. *Periclitamur argui seditionis*, (saith the Town-Clark) we have done more then we can well answer ; We may be indicted of Treason for this days work, for coming together without a Trumpet. And yet it was for *Diana*, that is, for a matter of Religion.

* You see then whose the Right is, and what the duties
 * be to it, and in whose steps they tread that deny them;
 * Sure, they have been baptized, or made to drink of the
 * same water (the water of *Meriba*) that ever shall offer
 * to do the like, to draw together without *Moses's* call.
 * And now to our Saviour Christs Question: *In the Law*
 * *how is it written? How read you?* Our Answer is;
 * There it is thus written, and thus we read, That *Moses*
 * hath the right of the Trumpets, that they to go ever with
 * him and his Successors, and that to them belongs the
 * power of calling the Publick Assemblies. This is the
 * Law of God; and that no Judicial Law, peculiar to that
 * people alone, but agreeable to the Law of Nature and
 * Nations (two Laws of force through the whole world)
 * For even in the little Empire of the Body natural, *prin-*
 * *cipium motus*, the beginning of all motion is in and from
 * the Head: There all the knots, or (as they call
 * them) all the conjugations of sinews have their head,
 * by which all the Body is moved. And as the Law of
 * Nature, by secret instinct, by the light of the Creation,
 * annexeth the Organ of the chiefest part; even so doth
 * the Law of Nations, by the light of Reason, to the
 * chiefest person; and both fall just with the Law here
 * written, where (by *erunt tibi*) the same Organ and
 * Power is committed to *Moses*, the principal person; in
 * that Commonwealth; The Law of Nations in this point
 * (both before the *Law written*, and since, where the
 * *Law written* was not known) might easily appear, if
 * time would suffer, both in their general order for con-
 * ventions so to be called, and in their general opposing
 * to all Conventicles called otherwise.

49. Afterwards he shews how practise ran in this point,
 and shews that *Josua*, the next to *Moses* in chief Magi-
 stracy, succeeding in execution of this power; When he
 (not *Eliazar*) assemble all the Tribes, Levi and all, to
Sichem. *Josh. 24: called them together at the first verse, dis-*
solved it at the 28. Which being in a matter Ecclesiastical, he
doth

doth (as he says) particularly note, because it is by some objected concerning Moses, that for a time he dealt in matters of the Priests Office. Then he doth descend to the state of their Kings, and shews particularly how they used this power till the Captivity: In which he shews how it was used by Mordecai (when he came in place of authority) appointing the days of Purim, and calling all the Jews in the Province together, to the celebrating of them. After the Captivity, he instanteth in *Nehemiah* his using of it, and so falls to the *Maccabees*, and proves it used by those that were then chief Governours. Afterwards he tells how this power was exercised by Christian Emperors and Kings upon their first receipt of Christianity, and instanteth in general and National Councils and Assemblies. Amongst whom we may not onely say that not onely *Constantine*, *Jovianus*, and others the prime Founders and Restorers of Christianity did not come in by the election of the Senate (the way which was then held lawful) but that they, and most others were brought in by the force of a prevailing party; nay commonly, at first, set up by one part of the Army only; and yet the Christians in those times gave them always the same respect and obedience which was by the Law of God due to their Governor in chief: So that he that shall read their Stories, and observe the legality of their entrance, will not beleieve (as I said) that Bishop *Andrews* in what he said against such as *Nimrod*, did ever intend that such like Usurpations as might by some be attributed to those, should ever take from any that respect and subjection which did belong to the *Lords annointed*, and Head of the Church.

50. Afterwards the Bishop shews how *Constantine* and his Successors held those Trumpets for a Thousand years after Christ, and then one of them (saith he) fol: 113. by what means we all know, was let go by them, or gotten away and carried to *Rome*; But that getting hath hitherto been holden a plain usurping, and an usurping (not upon the Congregation, but) upon Princes and their Rights;

Rights; and that they, in their own wrong, suffered it
 to be wrung from them. And why? Because not to
 Aaron, but to Moses it was said, *Et erunt tibi*. To
 draw to an end, it was then gotten away, and with some
 a do it was recovered not long since: and what? you
 may please to remember, there was not long since a
 Clergy in place, that was wholly *ad oppositum*, and
 would never have yeelded ought: Nothing they would
 do, and in (eye of Law) without them nothing could then
 be done; they had incroached the power of Assembling
 into their own hands. How then? how shall we do for
 an Assembly? then *Erunt tibi*, was a good Text; it
 must needs be meant of the Prince; He had this power,
 and to him of right it belonged. This was then good Di-
 vinity (and what Writer is there extant of those times, but
 it may may be turned to in him?) And was it good divi-
 nity then, and is it now no longer so? Was the King
 but licenced for a while, to hold this power, till another
 Clergy were in; and must he then be deprived of it a-
 gain? Was it then usurped from Princes, and are now
 Princes usurpers of it themselves? And is this all the
 difference in matter of the Assemblies, and calling of them;
 that there must be onely a change; and that instead
 of a Forreign, they shall have a Domestical, and instead
 of one, many; and no remedy now, but one of these
 two they must needs admit of. Is this now become
 good Divinity? Nay (I trust) if *Erunt tibi* were once
 true, it is so still; and if (*Tibi*) were then *Moses*, it is
 so still; That we will be better advised, and not thus go
 against our selves, and let truth be no longer truth, then
 it will serve our turns. And this calls to my mind the
 like dealing of a sort of men, not long since here among
 us. A while they plied Prince and Parliament, with *Ad-*
monitions, Supplications, Motions, and Petitions: And
 in them, it was: their duty, their right, to frame all things
 to their new invented plot; And this, so long as any
 hope blew out of that coast. But when, that way (they
 saw)

(saw) it would not be, then took they up a new Tenet straight: They needed neither *Magistrate* nor *Trumpet*, they; The godly among the people might do it of themselves, for confusion to the wise and mighty, the poor and simple must take this work in hand, and so by this means the Trumpet prove their right, in the end; and so come by devolution to *Demetrius* and the Craftsmen. Now if not for the love of the truth, yet for very shame of these shifting absurdities, let these phantasies be abandoned; and (that which Gods own mouth hath here spoken) let it be for once and for ever true; That which once we truly held and maintained for truth, let us do so still; that we be not like evil Servants, judged (*Ex ore proprio*) out of their own mouths.

Let me not overweary you; let this rather suffice. 1. We have done as our Saviour Christ willed us, resorted to the Law, and found *what is written*, (the Grant of this power to *Moses*, to call the Congregation.) 2. We have followed *Moses's* advise, *enquired of the days before us*, even from one end of heaven to another, and found the practise of this Grant in *Moses's* Successors, and the Congregation so by them called. It remaineth, that as God by his Law hath taken this order, and his people in former ages have kept this order, that we do so too; that we say as God saith, *Erunt tibi*, this Power pertaineth to *Moses*. And that neither with *Core* we say, *Non venimus*; nor with *Demetrius* run together of our selves, and think to carry it away with crying, *Great is Diana*. But as we see the power is of God, so truly to acknowledge it, and dutifully to yield it; that so they whose it is may quietly hold it, and laudably use it, to his glory that gave it, and their good for whom it was given. Which God Almighty grant, &c.

I have the more largely made recital of this Sermon, because all along it is so express in clearing of most of those objections which are now made. Now as it was then in answer to the Recusants and Nonconformists of those times

times, in which respect I fear that what is let down towards the end thereof touching stubbornness in conformity towards the chief Magistrate in matters of Reformation, when it shall be by him thought necessary, will but too needly condemn some amongst us with apostacie and tergiversation from their first principles, and that *ex ore proprio* (as he saith) because they do now deny him the exercise of that power, which hitherto themselves and the most eminent of their party have maintained to be their due. For he sheweth, that since the Church hath *her Wars to fight, and her Laws to make, as well as the Civil State*; that therefore it is as necessary there should be a continual power to call and preside in all Assemblies made to that purpose in the Church, as well as in the State: That these Trumpets are to be of one peece, *Unum juris*: That *this power is from God, immediately derived unto one, without first settling it into any body collective at all*. And therefore truly if a whole National Church can claim no Church power, no one party, or separate Order therein can, although they should be as eminent as *Aaron* himself; No, both powers are delivered to *Moses*, not for his time onely, but as he had it, as the chief Magistrate, so to succeed to such as should be chief Magistrates amongst the people of God, as a *7us Regale* to him that should be *Rex in 7eshru-ne*; although in strict propriety, he be no more King then *Moses* was. And then he censures such as would, in regard of their separate order fain have had a separate power. *It may be* (saith he) *if we communicate with flesh and blood, we may think it more convenient (as some do) that God had delivered Moses and Aaron either of them one: But when we see Gods Will by Gods Word what it is, that Moses is to have them both; we will let that pass as a revelation of flesh and blood, and think that which God thinketh to be most convenient*. And hence he infers, that in respect of this sole and supreme power the Church or Congregation must not come uncalled, or refuse to come when called; that is, must not act against, or without him, but

but according to his direction in Church Affairs; these being the *two duties which* (he saith) *Gods people have ever duly performed to the two Trumpet.* No meeting without a Trumpet, like *Demetrius and his Craftsmen*, out of love to any *Diana* of their own liking, as Nonconformists formerly did; nor no slighting of the Magistrates call, like *Core and his Company*, out of conceit of equal holiness with him, or in favor to the supremacy of some other Head, as the then Recusants did. After that, instancing how the Magistrates here, had been troubled with those of the *Roman* Clergy, and with that of the Non-conforming party too, who would neither yeeld that he should at all make Reformation, nor like that he had made, but would have those Trumpets and Powers in other hands; he exhorts (as I may do) to constancy in this Doctrine, saying, *That which we once held and maintained for truth, let us do so still; that we be not like evil Servants judged, ex ore proprio.*

§1. For when, as it was by the Papists usually objected against our Reformation, that no such thing was necessary, since no such Heresie or Superstition was in their Doctrine, or publick form of Worship as was alleadged; and having in proof of them brought in divers Texts of Scripture, and also produced evidence of general Practise of a Thousand years for most of them, in that Church which at that time was held Catholick: I do not for my part find, but that the chiefest stress of lawfulness of Reformation lay, as I said before, in asserting the power of the chief Magistrate. And that way ran the late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* also; who in his Answer to the Jesuite *A C. Sect. 26. num 11. fol. 205.* says, *Emperors and Kings are custodes utriusque tabulae; they to whom the custody of both Tables of the Law, for Worship to God, and the Duty to Man, are committed; That a Book of the Law was by Gods own command in Moses his time to be given the King; That the Kings under the Law, but still according to it, did proceed to necessary Reformation in*

Church businesses, and therein commanded the very Priests themselves; as appears in the Acts of Hezekiah and Josiah, who yet were never censured to this day for usurping the Priests Office. That the greatest Emperors, for the Churches honour, Theodosious the elder, and Justinian, and Charls the Great, and divers other, did not onely meddle, now and then, but Enact Laws to the great settlement and increase of Religion in their severall times.

51. If more satisfaction be requisite to assert not one the Kings Right to meddle in these things, but even to shew the necessity of having a King to that very purpose, let us see the judgement of Bishop Andrews in another place, where he is speaking upon that Text, *In those dayes there was no King in Israel*; and using these words fol. 122. 'This is not noted as a desert in gross, or at large; but even in Israel, Gods own chosen people. It is a want (not in Edom, or Canaan, but) even in Israel too, the want of a King. Truly Israel, being Gods own peculiar might seem to claim a prerogative above other Nations, in this, that they had the knowledge of this Law, whereby their eyes were enlightened, and their hands taught, and so the most likely to spare one, others had not like light; yet this, *non obstante*, their light and their Law, and that they were Gods own people, is no *Supersedens* for having a King; of which there needeth no reason but this, That a King is a good means to keep them Gods Israel, here, for want of a King Israel began, and was fair onward, to be no longer Israel, but even Babel. When Mica (and by good reason any other as well as he) might set up Religions, and give Orders themselves; as it were in open contempt of God and his Law. So that, the people of God can plead no exemption from this, since it is his own Ordinance, to make them and keep them the People of God. Was it thus here in the Old Testament, and is it not so likewise in the New? Yes, even in the New too; for there Saint

Peter

' *Peter* willeth them that they be subject to the King, as
 ' to the *Sovereign*, or *Most Excellent*. And *Saint Paul*
 ' goeth further, and expresseth it more strongly, in the
 ' *Stile of Parliament*, and (like a Law-giver) saith,
 ' *ὑποτασσέσθε*, Be it Enacted that they submit themselves :
 ' And when *Saint Paul* there, had in his *Act* said, *Omnis*
 ' *anima* ; That this *Act* reacheth to every soul, which was
 ' enough : Yet because that seemed too general, *Saint*
 ' *Peter* came after, and goeth to the very point, and saith,
 ' *Gens sancta* must do thus too ; That is, there must be a
 ' King even in *Gods Israel*. And, what would we more ?
 ' I come to the third part ; And to what end a King ?
 ' *Quid faciat nobis* ? What will a King do unto us ? It
 ' it hath been said already ; He will look that every one do
 ' not that which is good in his own, and evil in *Gods eyes* :
 ' He will in his general care look to both parts the *Eye* and
 ' the *Hand* : The eye that men sin not blindly, for want
 ' of direction ; the hand that men sin not with an high
 ' hand (that is wilfully) for want of correction. He will
 ' be their good *Ophthalmist*, with right *Eye-salve*, that the
 ' sight may be cured, and things seem as they be, and not
 ' be as they seem. At the hardest, *si noluerunt intelligere*,
 ' but the eye will rove and run astray, that the hand be
 ' bound to the good abearing. That they do it not ; or if
 ' they do it (as do it they will, yea though there be a
 ' King) yet that they may not do it impune ; do it, and
 ' nothing done to them for it, and scape the punishment
 ' due unto it ; for, that is the case, when there is no King
 ' in *Israel*. And if, when there is one, that be the case
 ' too, where have we been all this while ? For if so, *E-*
 ' *tiam non est Rex, cum est Rex* : Then when there is a
 ' King, there is no King ; or one in name, but none in-
 ' deed. Which as it is not good for the *State*, so nei-
 ' ther is it safe for themselves. To this, special regard will
 ' be had : *Nomen enim frustra* (saith *St. Paul*) for they bear
 ' not the *Sword* in vain : That every one do not thus.
 ' Every one, but namely (which is the occasion of this

'Text) that not *Mica*, for *Mica's* fact brought forth this
 'first sight: That they were not come to this pass, that
 'he, or any such as he was, might set up in his house any
 'Religion he would, and no man controule him for it. To
 'look to every one therefore, but especially to *Mica*;
 'and to care for all, but above all, the matter of Religion,
 'Ne quisque videat quod rectum est, there; that every
 'one be not allowed to see Visions there: At least, Ne
 'quisque faciat, that, see what they list, they be not suf-
 'fered to set them up: But if the Eye will not be recti-
 'fied, the Hand be restrained. And sure, no where doth
 'the eye more misse, nor the hand swerve, then in this;
 'and therefore no where more cause to call for a King,
 'then for this. One would think this were impertinent,
 'and we were free enough from *Mica*. We are not. Even
 'to this day, do men still cast Images or Imaginations (all
 'as one) in the mould of their conceits, and up they set
 'them, at least for their own houshold to adore. And
 'then if they can get such a fellow, as is hereafter descri-
 'bed, a Levite for ten Shekels and a Suit; (or because
 'now the world is harder, ten pound) they are safe, and
 'there they have and hold a Religion by themselves. For
 'evident it is by this Text, setting up of false Worship, is
 'the cause why Kings were missed; and the redress of it,
 'why they were placed; The cause, I say, and the first
 'cause of their placing, and therefore this a part, and a prin-
 'cipal part of their Charge. I will touch them severally.
 '1. A part to look to *Mica* and his false Worship. Why,
 'this is matter Ecclesiastical? It is so, and thereby it ap-
 'peareth (I think) that Kings have and are to have a hand
 'in matters of that nature: If Religion were at fault, be-
 'cause there was no King; and that one there must be, to
 'set it right again. For is it once to be imagined, that the
 'cause of corrupt Religion is laid on the want of a King;
 'and yet when there is one he should not meddle with it;
 'Rather the consequence is strong on the other side, *Mica*
 'thus did, because there was then no King; therefore
 when

'when there is one he will look better to it, that never a
 'Mica of them all shall do the like Thus it went when
 'there was no King; after, when there was one, I find a-
 'gain, the not taking the High places (which were places
 'merely Religious where the people did Sacrifice) inpu-
 'ted still to the King as his fault; and yet shall he have
 'nothing to do with High places, or sacrificing either
 'there or any where else? Very strange it were, that they
 'who are by God himself, by an express *Ego dixi* termed
 'Gods, should yet have nothing to do with Gods affairs!
 'And no less, that being termed by *Isaiah* *Nutritis, Foster-*
 '*Fathers*, to whose care the Church is committed to
 'cherish and bring up, should yet be forbidden to inter-
 'meddle with the Church, in that which is of all fostering
 'the principal part: Verily, when the Apostle speaketh
 'of the service that Kings do unto God, he doth not onely
 'use the term of *λειτουργία* (that is) *Publick Officer*, but
 'δίακον too (as it were Gods *Deacon* or *Servitor*) by
 'a name peculiar to the Church Offices: and this he u-
 'ses twice for one other. It can therefore neither be de-
 'nied, nor doubted of, in that Idolatry came up by de-
 'fect of Kings, but that Kings were placed to pull down
 'Idolatry, and to plant and preserve the true Service of
 'God. In a word, there is a King in *Israel*, that there
 'may not be a Mica in *Israel*. That is, that no man be
 'suffered to set up any form of Worship formerly used, if
 'not now allowed, which was *Micha's* case with his *Tera-*
 '*phim*, and think that through some legal sanctimony inhe-
 'rent to the Ephod, and to that Priest that shall officiate (as
 'being a *Levite*) he shall be justified herein; and they
 'onely condemned that devise some new form to be exerci-
 'sed in their private meetings, and set up some other
 'sort of persons, even some Son of their own to be their
 'Minister therein: No, the use of a King will plainly ap-
 'pear out of what he hath said before, *That Gods people or*
 '*a Church cannot be without such a Government which is*
 '*necessary for them (as a Church) even for the making and*
 '*keeping*

keeping them the people of God, that is for keeping them united in one true Religion. That to him *Omnis anima, every soul is to be subject*, having power both to direct and correct; for else it would be for *Israel to have no King, when there is a King*. And therefore since (as he proved) he is to take care of Religion, and to see what forms of Worship are set up, it is not allowed to any to set up their private imaginations now, as *Mica* did his Images of old.

52. In those differences between the Nonconformists and Papists; the one in their imaginations liking of no form or settlement made by humane Direction or Precept, and the other attributing too much to their *Images*, the things themselves so settled, that speech of our Saviors concerning the disagreement between the *Samaritans* and the *Jews*, hath by way of comparison, often come into my mind; I have, on the one side, thought that to frame a Worship out of opposition, and to have no reason for it, but because *our Fathers did so*, is but (too *Samaritan* like) *to worship we know not what*; Whilst, without due consideration of the different degree of splendor and greatness which the Church shall by the goodness of God have in doing these things at one time more than another, we shall ingratefully forget to make suitable return in our expressions and acknowledgments thereof in his Worship. But then, on the other side again, when inward devotion is chiefly expected, to fancy that this or that precise form might, out of any inherent worth in it self, or out of singular opinion we have of some persons who first instituted them, be onely observed and none other, were now unreasonably to follow the example of the *Jews*, in fixing all adoration in one precise place, without consideration, that the Christian Church is not now, like theirs, included in one Nation, nor can be presumed so tyed to the constitution of any one Prince herein, as they were to *Solomon*, as to exclude others of equal jurisdiction and power, from making such alterations as they shall find suitable

ſuitable to that preſent condition they ſhall be in. If upon the ſcore of ancient imitation alone we tranſgreſs the order of that Church under which we live, then ſingularity and difference will render us but Innovators; and prove us rather antick then antient in our way of Worſhip.

53. ~~In theſe~~ much more I might have alleadged out of theſe Authors I have pitched upon in juſtification of ſupream Magiſtrates power in ordering the affairs of the Church; but theſe alleadged, being (as I conceive) plain and enough for ſatiſfaction of any unprejudiced perſon, I have ſpared that labor; and have alſo out of eaſe to the Reader, forborn quotations of many other famous men in our Church, concurring in the ſame judgement; and made moſt particular choice of, *Mr. Hooker* and *Biſhop Andrews*, as men generally held moſt famous and Orthodox in their generations; the one in the time of *Queen Elizabeth*, and the other ſince, even in the time of our late King: They were then, and are ſtill for ought I know, held to be the great Defenders of this Churches authority, and that of the chief Magiſtrate therein, againſt the then Re-cuſants and Nonconformiſts; and I hope their credit is not ſo loſt, but that their authority and yet arguments will remain of the ſame force ſtill to keep us from all inclinations either to Schiſm or Sedition; that we do not thereby give the world too juſt occaſion to ſay, we are indeed fallen from our Principles through ſome ſiniſter prejudice, or partial conceit of our own.

54: To direct and encourage in this conſtancy, let us revert to theſe grounds and reaſons before laid down, let us conſider that ſince the maintenance of love and charity, and the preſervation of mankind by peace, have ſo neceſſary a dependence upon ſubmiſſion to the Authority of that Church where we live, and ſince the Glory, Service and Worſhip of God here on earth, hath again ſo
near

near a relation unto this preservation of mankind by peace, that therefore in these, and things of the like nature (which are not of such express divine Precept, as to be demonstrable out of the Word of God, or are not fundamental to our salvation) there should no opposition be made to the disturbance of the peace of the Church: but, to that very end, all to submit to the determination of those that have chief power therein. Let not the crafts or designs of other men lead us to inquiet, so as to think, that in things of this nature, and where controversies and differences do daily arise between Church and Church, Christian and Christian, our salvation should be endangered while we incline to that side that maintains Charity, by submitting our selves to those that have the rule over us: To this end, I shall here record that remarkable speech of Dr. Usher late Primate of Armagh; *That in these Propositions which without all controversy are universally received in the whole Christian World, so much truth is contained, as being joyned with holy obedience may be sufficient to bring a man to everlasting salvation; Neither have we cause to doubt but that as many as walk according to this rule (neither overthrowing that which they builded by superinducing any damnable Heresies thereupon, nor otherwise violating their holy Faith, with a lewd and wicked conversation) peace shall be upon them, and upon the Israel of God.* This as it was alleadged by Dr. Potter, in his Treatise called *Charity mistaken* (for that the Church of Rome did make all things fundamental which she held, and thereupon excluded all from salvation that were not of her communion) so is it by Mr. Chillingworth in his Reply, fol. 20. held for as great and good a truth, and as necessary for these miserable times as can be uttered: For if it should stand with men in the point of salvation, according to that censure which each Church, or sect therein, doth put upon all that differ or descent from them, then could no one Christian hope for Heaven; insomuch as he must necessarily be a member of some Church or other, which in mat-
ters

ters of Doctrine or Discipline (if not both) is by some other Churches held so far Heretical or Schismatical, as to exclude all of that communion from hope of salvation; which thing the Papists do hold concerning all Protestants in general, and many of the Protestants hold of them again; and do also pass their sentence as hardly of one another. But our comfort is, that we shall at the last day, be judged by him who knows our hearts, and whether we have not sought and followed his Truth according to the utmost of the ability he gave us; and not left to the sentence of such, as, out of pride, prejudice, or other interest, are so ready to put an over-value upon their own Tenets, and become both Parties and Judges.

55. Concerning those aspersions of *Herese* and *Schism* which are now so frequently thrown by one party upon another, I have in the general observed that where the names and notions themselves are of nest repeated, and most stood upon, there the Arguments used for confutation are the less, or less weighty. It faring, in some mens discourses and writings about controversies, as with women in their scolding; where she that can call Whore lowdest; and ofteneft, is conceived to have got the better of it: So (usually) there is nothing to be perceived but a design cast towards dispragement; when the imputation of those Ecclesiastical railing terms are used towards any, without any remonstrance or proof wherein their ill consists; or how their Opponents are justly to be charged with them.

56. As for *Herese*, I do not see why any Christian mans case should be held desperate, that in things not fundamental, cannot bring his judgement to assent to that of anothers: always provided that it proceed not from, or be encreased through discontent, pride, or affected singularity, and that he hold it peaceably to himself; not seeking to disturbe the peace of the Church by publication thereof to others; for then it plainly shews that some

of those other corrupt Principles had a hand in the entertainment, as well as in the divulging of it: And then it will come to pass, that that which would as in it self, and as considered as matter of speculation, have been an error in judgement onely, being now infused into others, so as to induce action and separation, will argue pravity in the will, and turn into Schism; which I do look upon as a sin, not to be at any time, or in any Persons otherwise excusable: then when the foundation of Faith or good manners cannot be otherwise preserved. And because in all dissenting parties that live under any Christian Authority, the name of Schismatick is by either side cast on the other; I do hold it for a maxime, that that party is onely free that conforms to the Rule set down by him that is Head of that place, and all the rest Schismaticks; Even as in State differences, all parties that hold not with the Sovereign Power, are to be called this or that Faction, whereas the other is not to be called a Faction or Party, but rather to be looked upon as the whole, because united to the Head.

97. And therefore truly, if men could be once brought to put a greater rate upon things fundamental, and a less upon superstructures; considering that the not holding to the one brings on the loss of Heaven, and the too strict holding to the other, brings on the loss of Charity, and thereby shrewdly endanger the other also (besides that quick we should mutually reap in the exercise of Religion) we should preserve the State in quiet also; and prevent all those mischiefs we now so much complain of through changes therein; The which, of latter times have from hence chiefly taken their rise; when such as are seeking to make themselves more glorious or powerful, do daily make use of mens too great zeal and credulity in this kind, as the ordinary Stalking-horse hereunto. The instances whereof are plain enough in Christendom, especially since it became so divided into Sects; for the advance of any of which, as Gods Truth, we shall ever find the

the notion of Reformation cried up and alledged, but alteration in the State, and those that are in rule therein, is really brought in. If we do but reflect on some more remarkable passages among our selves, we may, from that smal difference which was in the *six Articles* themselves from the *Roman Doctrine*, well conclude, that the preservation of the Popes power as Head of the Church here, was more aimed at then truth of Religion; insomuch as a dispensation was ready to be granted for every thing, save for taking the Oath of Supremacy. When, on the other side again, both *Henry the Eighth* and his Successors, looked upon this foreign acknowledgement as a sure testimony of ill affection to them and their Government; Nay, the Law it self came to be resolute in that point too; accounting Popery to consist in the alienating and withdrawing of Subjects from their obedience to their Prince, to raise sedition and rebellion, &c.

§8. And so now also we find that presumption of malignancy and disaffection to the present Government and Governor, is most taken from that great affection which is cast to the use of this book; because, in so doing, they manifestly decline those acts and alterations which are made by him, and do submit to what was done by another. I have not heard that any man hath been particularly forbidden to read this Book that did in the use of it pray for the present Sovereign power, according to the form therein set down, and as always hath been used to be done towards them onely that were in present Authority. If that be not done, doth it not too plainly argue that some affection and zeal beside that of the Book it self, doth guide them in this choyce? Doth not the Scripture look to the present, when it enjoyns obedience to the Powers that are, and commands to pray for Kings and all that are in authority? Doth it any where in this case leave us to a choyce by distinction, saying such as *should be* in authority, or the like? And is it not a general rule, that *where the Scripture makes no distinction, neither should we*? No, in this

this case we may presume that the present higher Power and Kings were meant, without such distinction; both for that they were at that time such as might that way have been excepted against; and also for that the words following *that under them we may lead quiet and peaceable lives &c.* must determine the prayer to be made for that present Authority which we do *live under* and are subject unto. Nor do I find that ever any Orthodox pen but did confess prayer for that person under whose protection they lived, to be a duty incumbent upon all Christians, without referment of them to distinctions and qualifications. Nay, doth not the Book it self, in that prayer for the whole state of Christs Church militant here on earth, interpret this Doctrine of the holy Apostle to include all, and accordingly appointed us to pray for all Christian Kings, Princes and Governors? and when it comes with an especially for that person who shall be at present our Governour, ~~his~~ said, because he is the right Heir, or hath best Title, or the like? no, it hath still respect to the divine authority of the Apostles precept; and therefore presently gives the same reason, *that under him we may be godly and quietly governed.* In which respect I cannot, by the way, but highly commend that those frequent and full expressions which were made for those persons that were full in chief power amongst us, as proceeding from good principles, even the sense of honor and esteem, which was owing to that God whose Authority he did represent amongst us; when as now we may observe that those that have been possessed of the same party with the Protector, do yet either wholly neglect to pray for him at all, at least to mention him therein, and then do it so coldly and fumblingly, that partly by the falling of their voyce, partly by the conditional qualifications they mention in their prayer for him, they give but too just cause to suspect, they are not so rightly principled and persuaded concerning that high duty and respect which is due to him in this his relation; for as it becomes not them
in

in publick especially to censure him, so also not to insinuate any thing that might give occasion for others to do so, for this will be to pray rather against, then for him. But to return to the consideration of the Service Book, I say, that to prevent those jealousies and dangers which might happen to some amongst us, through too much forwardness to read, or abuse, and partialy in reading it the said Book, I have made all the foregoing Discourse; both to shew what is truly fundamental and necessary in our Christian Faith, and what rule to follow in our Christian Obedience; and to give satisfaction in that particular of taking away the Service Book; the thing for ought I see, now most insisted upon: I have to that end striven to evince that continual power which is continually residing in the Head of this, and each other Church, to abrogate as well as impose in things of that nature. Unto the confirmation whereof, I shall now onely by way of conclusion, add that Testimony of the University of Oxford, printed in the year 164-. who in their reasons against the *Discipline and Directory in place of the Service Book*, fol. 32. say, 'We are not satisfied how we can submit to such Ordinances of the two Houses of Parliament, not having the Royal assent, as are contrary to the established Laws of this Realm, contained in such Acts of Parliament as were made by the joynt consent of King, Lords, and Commons. Nor so onely, but also pretend by repeal to abrogate such Act or Acts; for since *ejusdem est potestatis destruere cujus est constituere*; it will not sink with us, that a lesser Power can have a just right to cancel and annul the Act of a greater. Especially the whole power of ordering all matters Ecclesiastical; being by the Laws in express words *for ever annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm*. And upon what head that Crown ought to stand, none can be ignorant. In this we see their plain concurrence in yeelding the power of abrogation of this Book to such as instituted it, even to him that should hold the Imperial Crown of this Realm. And

as for the words following, which by some may be thought uttered in derogation of the power now in being; we shall examine them with other Questions of that nature in the Chapter following.

CHAP. III.

*Of the imputation of USURPER,
and whether it do take off Sub-
jection.*

WE have formerly shewed the necessity to peace and union in reference to the Glory of God to be increased and set forth by the preservation and good of men, we have also shewed the necessity of submission to Government, and particularly commended Monarchy, as the most necessary and available means to maintain this peace and accomplish those other benefits in society to be expected. Now since not onely Religion, but the light of natural reason do teach, that this peace and benefit is a thing to be always followed and sought; and since without actual submission to those Powers that are from time to time actually in being, it cannot at no time be had, it comes thereupon to pass that those that are usual disturbers thereof, being such as are either leaders or followers, have (accordingly) names of guilt and odium fixed upon them; That through sense thereof they might be discouraged from such foule and pernicious undertakings. The one sort is of such as are ambitious to rule, and the other of such as are impatient of being ruled. The first will be executing any power which is not due to him in right of the place he holds, but to another,

another who is already seized of that Office, is there-upon called an Usurper; The other sort, that do resist the power of him that is so possessed, are usually distinguished by the name of Rebels; although, in truth, they are of such joyn't extraction, and so near a kindred, as we may count them one: for as none can resist Government but they must take upon them to judge and act in things proper thereinto; so again, none can well usurpe that doth not wishall rebel: And therefore, the first leading, and the last following, and both making usually but one Society, we may call the Usurper the Great Rebel, and the other the lesser Usurpers. These things being so, we need not wonder why first that notion of usurpation, or to usurp, properly signifying often using onely, and taken as well in a good as bad sence, when applied to other things, should always import evil, when applied to the case before rehearsed; Nay further, we may find the cause why this stile of Usurper, being in the primary intention to be fixed onely upon such as transcended the limits of their own Ranks and Callings, and take upon them to execute that jurisdiction and power wick was proper to the place of another, should now, as out of common detestation of the thing, be continued to the party when the usurpation is past, and he now in possession of that place from whence the maintenance of peace by execution of this power can onely be reasonably expected.

2 And onward, upon the same design again we may perceive the reason why few or none should set down in plain terms, that it was lawful for men to obey him that was an Usurper; for however the thing might have been conceived true, yet it might be apprehended an encouragement or abatement to the odium of such as should attempt the like. Which being so, we are not to wonder why it should come to pass in this, as in the imputation of Tyranny, or things of like nature, to wit, that through faction and personal interest and respect, that which was intended for common benefit, should be many times made

made use of for particular ends onely ; so that now usually the name of Usurper importing much evil, like the fore-said name of Tyrant, is but the remonstrance of discontent; and thereupon given usually to such as are in possession, however their title be, so long as any thing can be found out for the asserting of a better claim in some other person, in whose advance themselves have greater interest and hopes ; And therefore it may be observed, that as in all alterations, the dispossessed Prince is called Tyrant by one party, so the new one is by the other called Usurper, by which means, contrary to the first intention of preservation of publique peace by adhering to the party possessed, it is now thought by some just occasion to bring in rebellion and Civil War upon a whole land, rather then their particular favorite, with his conceived better Title, shall not be able to dispossess the other, which they now call by that name. But as they do hereby truly make themselves Rebels by disobedience or opposition, so do they make him they obey and countenance a true Usurper indeed; for want of possession of that place of authority unto which this obedience and subjection is due.

2. Thus shall we find Papists and those of the Roman party, in favour to their own Head, putting the scandal of usurpation upon all that Authority Ecclesiastical which Christian Princes exercise even in their own Dominions; while some again, upon the score of power claimed by the whole people, or some coordinate order of Magistracy or representation amongst them to elect or govern as in their right, are ready to reckon all such persons as Usurpers, and their power as usurped, that without election or confirmation, made in such measure as they shall approve of, take upon them the execution of Sovereign Power ; Nay, and sometimes the party possessed, for encrease of the odium, is called Tyrant also; for passion and not reason ruling them in their censure, they may upon every Act of Justice or Severity, which crosseth their interests or Luminors, say that the Laws of God and the Land
are

are broken in his regiment, as well as in his entry. Nay, indeed if it should be granted, that he that hath possession, and thereby prejudiced anothers right, cannot therefore claim obedience from those that stand by just relation subjected to that place of power which he holdeth, then truly for want of actual power so to do, all acts of Justice done and enforced in his name as Prince, would be but Tyranny in him, however they might have been lawfully executed by another. From the evil consequents and effects of these two opinions, the Monarchs of Christendom are seldom free; the notions of *Pope* or *People*, and the power belonging to them, being by discontented parties still urged as a just cause of their disturbance.

3. A third sort that make use of this scandalous name of *Usurper*, are of such, who in favor to some particular person only, now out of possession, would, upon the allegation of his right to govern, instigate those that are actually Subjects to him, to withdraw their allegiance, and give it to him that is not possessed at all: without regard to that publick disturbance which must thereupon ensue. And this doctrine hath less of reason to plead for it self then the other two. For first, they do it on the behalf of a whole Society of men, or some eminent Officers amongst them whom they would have preferred before this one person now possessed: And then they alleadge for themselves both Laws of Reason and Natural equity, and also positive Divine Constitutions, to shew that this power was by such original right vested in them, and therefore that no particular Sanction can deprive them of it. Whereas the other, as they would have whole Societies of men ruined and disturbed by Civil war, only to prefer and advance one single Person or Family before another, (who in reference to the State is as like to rule well, as he or his) so have they no allegation for it but some particular and private Laws, made at the instance of, and during the government of this person or his family: When as in truth, since in positive Edicts made by unequal authority, the last

is to stand and to be observed, they should of right be governed by these present Constitutions that do authorise the party in possession, and not those that are now abrogated and bereft of their force; even as that person or family they were made by and for, are bereft of their power.

4. If we shall apply these things to our selves in *England*, and examine how they have been generally resented by that part which was in that respect justly called the Royalist or Cavalier; we shall find all three sorts by them condemned as contrary to them in their original principles, which were, maintenance of Peace and Monarchy. The first two they opposed and went against as matters of fact, and which did already make disturbance: when as there being then no fear how disturbance would be made by claim the other way, and finding many Laws in force to continue their obedience to him in possession, they did usually inveigh not only against all Usurpation in attempt, but also against all right to possess and continue; the more to affright from, and discountenance such undertakings. In which last respect of lawfulness to possess or continue, they must still be understood to intend that Right which is to be considered in relation to the party dispossessed; against whom, and to whose prejudice (if he had right) he is only in reason to be taken as an unlawful Disseisor. And therefore they might, by these or the like imputations, be supposed to hope, that since in him was the fault of entrance whereby publike peace was disturbed, and it being in his power only by his quiet resignation to do personal right again, without civil war and blood, that for his farther incitement thereunto, they would also insinuate some unlawfulness to those acts of obedience which shal be done unto him by such as are now actually his Subjects.

5. To which end, and none other, we may well apply that additional Expression of the University of Oxford before set down, viz *On what head that Crown ought to stand, none can be ignorant.* For having before, pag. 7. alleadged the Act made 1 Eliz. 1. for restoring to the Crown the anni-

ent jurisdiction in things Ecclesiastical, they may by that Crown be well conceived to mean that Ecclesiastical authority which thereto belonged: And so not only to declare against that usurpation of power which the Parliament then took in their enacting in such matters, whilst the Crown (and consequently the power) did and ought to continue in him that was still reigning and actually possessed; but they might, in duty also to the settlement and security of their present Prince, as well as the settling of the peace of the Nation, have an aim hereby to prevent all attempt towards personal usurpation, by implying that that Crown ought not to be on any head but his who now wore it. But what if no such Head be? Must not the Crown be worn? Yes sure: For as they had before recited that Act whereby this Authority should be for ever united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm; so can we not reasonably presume it their meaning, that those Jurisdictions which should be of continual use and for ever annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm, should be understood so limited to any one person or family, as, in default of their wearing of it, (which must be supposed subject to humane chance and casualty) the Church should be deprived of that useful power.

6. In like manner are we to understand Bishop Andrews and all other, in their writings against Usurpation; that is, intending thereby so much more to confirm Subjects obedience to their present Prince. For, they then supposing that against him no such thing would be objected, and on the other side, fearing that Tyranny or any other crime which he might fall into might be alledged as a just excuse for insubjection, they did what they would to make the first odious, and these tolerable. In which doing, since their aim was good, they may be apprehended (out of duty) to be rather officiously, then truly guided in many of their expressions that way made; and that, as they did but hereby intend the more to conform obedience to him under whose power they then lived, so to be exemplar

herein to others; without permitting such as were now Subjects to do evil, that good may come of it; to wrong their own consciences by disobedience, that another may be righted in his private Title. And if we look in that Sermon of Bishop *Andrews* made of giving *Caesar* his due, we shall find him acknowledging as much; for (saith he) fol 91. *What Caesar was this, for whose interest Christ thus pleadeth? It was Tiberius, even he under whom our Saviour was (and knew he was to be) put to death; a stranger from Israel, a Heathen man, uncircumcised, an Idolater, an enemy to the truth, &c.* Where you see that obedience and tribute is directed to be paid to one that was as great a stranger to *Israel*, as great an Usurper in any legal power there, as *Nimrod* could be. And however *Nimrod* might be thought in other things to equal him, yet since he had no hand in putting our Saviour to death, we may well think that though it were unlawful for such as *Nimrod* thus to rise or reign, yet did he not intend it lawfull for Subjects to disobey, when thus up and ruling.

7. So that to take them, and all other in like sort, according to their right meaning (that is, to be constant in their direct respect to the common peace and benefit of the whole Society of men, without such partial eye to the favor of any particular person or family, as to abet what shall be contrary thereunto) we are to conceive, that as they had pitched upon Monarchy, as that which by Divine and humane light was fittest to accomplish this end, even so it was not to be supposed they would be so forgetful of their first original ground, as to invalidate that use and benefit which by Monarchy was to be expected; so as to give leave to Subjects to thrust him out again, as often as the Monarch should not have been to their liking; for this had been to overthrow that whole foundation they had before built upon, to wit, continual peace, by continual submission to the present Monarch. Whereas if any party of the Subjects might take upon them to withdraw
obedi-

obedience when they thought their Governour defective in Title, then, since it should seldom happen but that there might be some objections in that respect made by some discontented party or another, it would also follow, that for want of constant means how peace and agreement should for every time present be preserved, that course which they had designed, whereby it should be continually and at all times preserved, would contradict it self, and come to nothing. And therefore having endeavoured that this peace, as they thought, should never be interrupted, even by the course formerly mentioned, that is, laying so great imputation, and leaving such small hopes of enjoyment on those that should attempt it, they were less regardful to speak of any way to be taken after it was interrupted, and the publick peace now settled in another hand, left by any express allowance of a lawful obedience to him afterwards, they should (as we said) seem to cast more hopes and encouragements upon such like enterprises. And that their intentions hereby were onely to deter from such ambitious rising, and not from giving obedience to any in possession, we shall not find that any name of odium is found out, and given to such as live in subjection to Usurpers; which doubtless they would have done, had they conceived them as guilty in their obedience, as he in his entrance or command.

8. And if we shall appeal to matter of fact, we shall find the Cavalier party all along constant to the sure way of preservation of publick peace, by their adherence to the party possessed, and by opposing of such, as would upon the allegation of Usurpation, or want of title in him or his Ancestors, or for want of Election or Authority derived from the people, make all his commands and rule unlawful. And in order to this, was that maxime so often found in the mouths of that party, at such time as many personal defects and imputations were laid to the charge of the late King, *That the Crown was to be obeyed and fought for,*

for, although it stood upon a May-Pole; Which speech, as it had been taken from the Duke of Norfolk, so was it by him used in defence of his Loyalty to his present Sovereign, whom the other party called both Tyrant & Usurper.

9. And if we do impartially look upon the reason and ground of all Politick Constitutions of this kind. We shall find all contrary construction to arise from mistake or prejudice. For first, is there any thing more available to the continuance of publick peace, then that submission should be continued to the Monarch in possession? And then that there might be one always in possession, so as to make use of this submission, and that without danger of publick disturbance, through strife about the person to enjoy it, was it not again necessary, that by publick Edict it should be beforehand appointed to whom it should succeed, that all might be more deterred from seeking it? Which succession being not by the Law of God entailed on any one Family amongst Christians now, as amongst the Jews it formerly was on the Linage of David, will it not still rationally and equitably follow, that the possessor should have most right of any to have this entail settled on his Family? and do we not accordingly find that all Nations that have due regard to future peace and quiet, have joyned with the possessor in settling it accordingly? and will it not onward still follow, that in order to maintain the first Principles, we should be loyal to the Family so settled, so as to the utmost of our powers to defend them in their possession against all opposers, justly charging them with the imputation of Treason and Rebellion that are disturbers of publique peace in favour to the claim of any other whatsoever? But then again, will it not from the same Principles still follow, that in case my loyal endeavors shall not have their wished success, but that the other party shall set up another Monarch, and that in such full possession as now to be quietly and generally submitted to, as in the Seat of Justice, (the Laws being executed in his name, as they were in the others before) that then

then present peace depending on present obedience, and present obedience on present Power and Command, therefore I that was before a Loyalist in maintenance of the power in being, am now a Rebel, if I change my principles, I continue not loyal to him that is so; having in that regard changed conditions with those that were Rebels before, who by their adherence to the present power and maintenance of peace thereby are now become the true Royalists.

10. If we shall examine the grounds and intentions of our own fundamental constitutions concerning this Government and Governors, therein we shall find them to be the same: Namely, the design of peace by submission to the present Monarch, without regard to the title of King, or Family of which he was of. And to this end it may be observed, that in the Act made in *Henry* the Eighth's time, wherein his Supremacy is asserted, it is set down 24. *Hen. 8. c. 12.* [Where by divers sundry old authentic Histories and Chronicles is manifestly declared and expressed, that this Realm of *England* is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the World, governed by one supreme Head and King, having the Dignity and Royal estate of the Imperial Crown of the same, unto whom a Body Politick compact of all sorts and degrees of people, being bounden and sworn to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience, &c.] By which words we may easily discover some determination touching the present dispute, by observing what is therein set down as the foundation and original of this Government; to wit, that it is, and always hath been an Empire or Monarchy as well over all estates in itself, as independent of any other: And then as it is called an Empire as well as Realm, so may that Head thereof be called Emperor, or the like, as well as King; he whosoever he is that is at any time Monarch or Head thereof, is he to whom all sorts of people been bounden and sworn to bear next to God a natural and humble obedience. It is no part of the fundamental Law

to appropriate it for perpetuity, to the family of *Plantagenet*, *Tudor*, *Stuart*, or the like, no authentick Record, to be brought for that; that as it must be excepted as a secondary constitution made in order to preserve the first, he must give it place when the other is indangered. As for the first, I conceive that if King and Parliament should enact that this Government should be a Monarchy no longer, it would be void, not onely as contrary to the Law of God and Reason, but as a thing without their jurisdiction, even as overthrowing that power whereby themselves had power, or that fundamental Rule or Law whereby themselves were made Law makers. He that is in possession being the present Monarch by that Law established, may by vertue of that Authority he hath over all under him, for peace sake, determine and enact that the Sovereign Power shall descend to his Heir; and no doubt but he is therein to be obeyed by all that are his Subjects. In case he be either naturally or politickly dead, and those that were his Subjects become the Subjects of another, then the fundamental Law that aims at continuance of peace by continuance of Monarchy, must in like manner be presumed to determine the subjection and obedience to this present possessor and his Family. Want of due consideration whereof, we shall find one of the chief grounds why some of more consciencious sort, as well of those that have, as have not been of that party, are so hardly drawn to conceive right of things of this nature; and also for want of due distinction and differencing of that condition, which through alteration of time, may come to make the same person to contract a different guilt in the entrance into this place of power, over it is in the execution of it. How a man may be an unlawful intruder in to an Office whereunto a lawful power doth belong, when yet, being possessed, he is lawfully to be obeyed by all that stand subjected to those that are in this place of power. For want of which due consideration, and how those exceptions and objections usually made against the lawfulness

ness of Government gotten by Usurpation, are to be, as before noted, differently understood in reference to the commander and obeyer, much trouble doth many times arise; for he though, he may not lawfully hold the place by authority whereof he doth command, yet ought he lawfully to be obeyed by the authority of that Office which he doth hold.

11. Two great faults and mistakes therefore there may be observed which do daily administer occasion of much trouble in things of this nature, by frustrating divine and positive Edicts of their true intent, through their making so great a separation between those that are necessarily to this end conjoyned, that is, the power and person thereby impowered; for while some would have obedience to the power onely, as Gods Ordinance, without due regard to the person, they make the power vain, by leaving no possibility whereby it should be reduced into act. These being affected with so much ambition or impatience against Church or State Rulers, are crying out with *Core* and his company, *You take too much upon you*, and power is in the whole Congregation, in the whole people; by which means they are about to usurp, and keep the real execution of power to themselves, while they leave to others onely the Titles and formalities thereof. And some again, having too personal regard herein, and striving to make the worth and value of the power depend on their affectionate choyce, do thereupon shrewdly hazard, if not wholly defect that true esteem and benefit which is to be given unto, and expected from this conjunction. These may be reckoned of *Ephesians* company, that report not *Alexander* as King, but the King as he is *Alexander*, and in justification of this their opinion, and the attempts of their Favorites in this kind, comes the title of Usurper to be every where so commonly applied by the dispossessed and his Favorers to all persons in possession of power, although they might perhaps have the better title of the two, even as among our selves

in that doubtful claim between the Houses of *York* and *Lancaster*, each party threw it upon the other on purpose to withdraw the Subjects allegiance from his Adversary all that he could. For although each party in presumption of his better title had agreed, that obedience to an usurped power was not lawful, especially when known and voluntary given; when as yet prejudice would not give them leave to consider, that when obedience to this Power commanded by its proper Officer now in actual seisure thereof, is always both lawful and necessary, that is, always lawful for Subjects to obey, though not lawful for him (it may be) to continue in command.

12. And if we seriously look into the true ground of these aspersions, we shall find both the imputation of *Usurper* fastned on him that commands, and *Flatterer* on him that defends, to proceed from heat and prejudice alone. And therefore they seldom go rationally to work, and shew what are those evils and inconveniences, as in order to peace and publique good, that do attend on subjection or acknowledgment of any that is now peaceably obeyed as in the sovereign power; and that this is no way to be avoided, but by striving to remove the person possessed: Then indeed might they have had some ground for disobeying him themselves, and for calling others Flatterers that wrote or spake in his behalf. But else to write or speak in the defence of him who by the Law of God and Reason, and present Law of the Nation is to be so acknowledged, and in a case too, apparently tending to publike peace and good; is not flattery, but duty: whereas he that out of private or personal regard, would, to the plain disturbance and unsettlement of the State, perswade to a present obedience where there is not a present power, may be truly called a Flatterer or Self-seeker; both as making his address and acknowledgment where it is not due, and by being therein swayed out of discontent of something past, or out of hope of increase of private advantage to come to himself by the change.

13. And therefore in such like disputes as these, passion or interest will be always subject to bias and mislead us in personal adherence, if we do not lay aside our private respects, and candidly and conscionably look back into those true grounds and reasons why obedience did originally come to be given to any one man at all; being (as heretofore we shewed) Gods glory by mans peace. And this will be found the most warrantable and surest way to discover unto us that person who at any time is to have it. And to this end I have judged it a well-grounded Maxim, *Love the King for Peace sake, and Peace for Gods sake*. For since none but God can be perfectly good, so as to be loved for his own sake only; so all other things being good but *suo modo*, or according to their relation, and that serviceableness and benefit they afford to other things (that stand his creatures and witnesses of his goodness and glory amongst us) they must still be personally loved and respected according to such their present relations: whereas those that want that relation, cannot, out of any separate respect and value that is in themselves be esteemed right objects of that love and respect which is only due in regard of the relation it self.

14. So that the way to clear our selves of prejudices, and to understand things aright, is to consider them in their proper ranks and conditions, and to distinguish them by their proper names: Even to put a difference between such as are justly called Usurpers, upon reasons before spoken, namely by assumption of that power which by place belongeth not to them, (as for the *Woman to usurp authority over the Man*, or Subjects over their Prince) and such as do dispossess any of the place it self; the which last are to be esteemed Disseisors or Intrudors. For although the wrong done by the Disseisor be greater then that of the Usurper, as to the party dispossessed; yet in respect of their right to obedience, the first hath only right herein of the two, the other having none at all. And therefore in reference to that necessary conjunction which is to

be upheld in the union of the person with the power, 'tis well to be observed how God *hath joyned these two together* to the intent that no man, through interest or prejudice, should put them asunder. For where he enjoins subjection to the *Higher Power as his ordinance*, and sets forth the penalty of doing otherwise; he presently denotes it to be personally due, by subjecting us to those that are *Rulers*: For *Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to evil*; that is, they being possessed of this power, are to be expected just avengers of Resistance, therefore called evil, because the cause of so much evil. And then when it after follows, *Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same*; it is presently appropriate to that person which God in his providence hath set over us: For he (that is, this person) is the *Minister of God to thee for thy good*; that is, Gods Deacon or Vicegerent in preservation of Peace by means of this submission. And so it afterwards followeth, *He beareth not the sword in vain*; and, *He is the Minister of God, &c.* And as we find the power and person thus conjoined, so that it might be always effectual to this end, it is also enjoined in the present tense, without any exception to the lawfulness or validity in the title to enter or rule by; when it is said, *The Powers that are* (that is, the Powers in being) *are ordained of God.---He is, and He beareth, &c.* And so also when we are elsewhere enjoined to *make prayers for Kings and all that are in authority, that under them we may live quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty*; these words [*that are in authority*] denoting present authority, cannot (as heretofore noted) warrant any exception to be made by those that are to obey: For then it should not be effectual to the leading of a quiet and peaceable life, nor would the duties pertaining to Godliness be so duly and freely exercised: And we may consequently conceive, that obedience and subjection is not to be given to such as are not in authority, nor to Powers that are not in being. And that Text especially, where we are commanded

manded to fear God and the King, and not to meddle with those that are given to change; will be express in obedience to the King or person in present power and possession: For why else should we be forbidden to seek to change him, or meddle, or joyn with them that would do so, in such unlimited words? If to seek to change by way of sedition, had been thought lawful for Subjects, upon any ground, by him that said, *That against the King there is no rising up*, then surely this precept was very wrong put; especially not having any such exception; for rather the word *not* should have been left out, and the precept have been, *Meddle with them that would change*, or are seditious towards it; for sedition must precede change in that kind.

15. And if we do not carry an equal and impartial respect to persons dignified by Gods Ordinance, we shew plainly we have no respect to his Ordinance at all; but would have it an Ordinance of our own: When as the power thereby claimed, is to be at no time of value without our approbation; and by this means fall within the compass of Saint James his reproof, *To have the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ with respect of persons*. For, as in his instance, if those that are unequal in worldly honor or title, are yet equally to be respected as they stand equally our Christian Brethren; so also, such as are now in power, are, for their power sake, and for the honor of him that ordained it, to be equally respected and obeyed, however there might be a greater share of outward worldly title in one man then another. So then we may see the way to be a constant Royalist, is to be a constant Loyalist; not to respect the power or place for the persons sake, but the person for the place and power sake: And thereby, according to our duty having respect to God and his Precept, before our own. If we do not this, he that to day was Loyal, may to morrow be brought turn Rebel and Traytor, through that change of Families which stories do tell us have in this thrust out one another.

17. But some would make Prescription the onely way to lawfulness in possessions of things of this nature, as well as it is for silencing of Claims between Subjects in their private possessions; but since they have not yet, nor cannot, upon any true ground, agree in limiting of this time, it argues the thing it self to be but a fruitless invention: For although towards the ending of Suits and Quarrels, each State and Kingdom do, by Laws of its own, prefix a certain time in which possession shall in certain cases be a good plea in it self against all other, yet this Law being positive, bears always an exception to the Law-maker himself, as having continual power to right himself and all others in case of equity; according to that maxim, *Nullum tempus occurrit Regi*. And therefore although it may be available to silence private titles in regard of a superior power to appoint it, and see it executed accordingly, yet it will not thereupon follow, that Subjects may fancy any such Laws to bind their Prince by. And therefore when questions of this kind shall arise for confirmation of Law-makers themselves, I know not any Superior under God himself, who shall ascertain this prescription, and see it executed accordingly. And if we but mark the thing it self, in its original rise and ground, we shall find them gain-saying themselves, and laying that very first possession which they disallow, for a foundation of that which they would have to be right afterwards. For in such variety of times prescribed, suppose it should be a Hundred years; when, and where must we begin to accompt? Must it be from the first day of the parties secret plotting or attempt to get into this place of power? How shall that be truly known? And if you leave that out of the computation of unlawful action, which was most of all so, and begin to compute it from the time of possession, then shall we want a Judge to state when that did precisely begin; and thereupon when it shall take end, so as to say to the Subjects, *The Hundred years are now out, you have all this while been subject for wraths sake onely, now you must submit*

submit for conscience sake also; yesterday, being but the Ninety ninth year, and Three hundred sixty fourth day since the Family got possession, it was never made lawful till this very day; Thus they that deny right of obedience to the possessor, do yet derive right from possession, and by consequent, grant it to be due thereunto. And surely if men had had that due regard to publick peace which they should, and in respect whereto it might be thought that they had prefixed a time to silence disputes of that nature, they would not then have so far lengthened it, as to pass that limit, wherein it was not supposable, that the dispossessed should continue at all, or in such repute or power as to disturb him that had all this while been settled; and not, on the other side, while disturbance is most to be feared, left them at liberty for to attempt it.

17. Again, Will they make one prefixed time serve for legitimating the Government of all new Families, notwithstanding that great difference in right to claim, and way of entry that may be observed in them? they then become unjust: If they make difference, then who shall be Judge concerning him who shall really be esteemed an Usurper, amidst that great partiality which interest or envy useth to cast that way, as well for making Usurpers that are not, as acquitting those that are so; and again, for aggravating or lessening the faults of such as are?

18. If we think of some foreign power, as that of the Pope, or the like, to undertake in this kind, as he hath sometime done, how shall we do for another to place above him again, to see that particular spleen or interest have not made him partial also: So far as to make *Charles Martel* and his Son lawful possessors, notwithstanding known precedent usurpation, even while he was Master of the Palace; and on the other side, to call King *Henry the Eighth*, who was an Hereditary possessor, an Usurper, while he acknowledged not him for Supreme?

19. Will

19. Will they put it to Subjects themselves to judge whether their Prince be at all, and how far, and in what degree an Usurper, to the end that they may know whether, or how far obedience is to be given unto him? What hope of agreement in their Verdict? Nay, is it not the sure way to set them at disagreement, and consequently, to introduce Civil War? for since he should not at all have been possessed, if the wills and power of those that opposed him, as wanting title, could have prevailed against the greater number or power of such as elected and helped him in, how then can we imagine that these should now not only let go their superior power herein, which they have all this while contended for, but also submit that equal vote they have as Subjects, to be overborn and silenced by the desires of their enemies, in the dethroning their friend, and admission of a known adversary into supreme power over them; who by their past opposition, they must now expect also to be heightened with thoughts of revenge?

20. Is it not therefore much better, and more becoming such, as have any real love to the peace and welfare of the Church and State where they live, to labour to distinguish and free themselves from private and personal respects and prejudices, and ingeniously to examine all things according to their prime intention and aim, which is preservation of God glory, by preservation of men; and preservation of men, by preservation of publick peace and agreement? What and if (for reasons before set down) some have not so plainly asserted obedience and loyalty to an Usurper as they have to a Tyrant? can we yet otherwise think then, that as their intention was to preserve peace in this case to the publick, notwithstanding the publick it self must therein suffer; even so, and much more must we imagine, that in this other case, where onely one person or Family doth suffer, that yet they should leave men at liberty to make disturbance in the publick, as often as passion or interest should furnish Subjects with occasion

occasion of such imputation? No certainly; had they meant that the Subjects of any Prince now peaceably settled might under colour of Usurpation withdraw their allegiance, they would not then have so firmly asserted that this allegiance was due to Tyrants; since that, as formerly said, can never be practised without Usurpation, and that in a more continued and high measure, and also accompanied with more pernicious and dangerous consequents then in the other. For whereas a new Prince is called Usurper, for breaking the Law made in behalf of the dispossessed in particular, doth not the Tyrant much more break and transcend those Laws, and the Laws of God and Nature also, in what he doth in detriment to the publike? And doth he not daily repeat the same breach, and newly violate them, as often as he doth tyrannise? Whereas Usurpation consisteth only in one act, against one single person or family of the whole, and is not daily prosecuted like the other, to the detriment of all in general. Let us not therefore invert the prime intention of Laws, and make that destructive to Peace, which was purposely framed to preserve it; by the wilful mistake of their meaning, that seem to ascribe unlawfulness to the rule of Usurpers, or possession of Usurpers. And this we shall best do, if we do but reflect on that different condition the same person is to be look'd upon in relation to that Prince or family he opposeth or dispossesseth, and in relation to the rest of the Subjects and Nation; and this also in reference to what shall be by him done before he is possessed, over what it is afterward.

21. While any one is attempting thus to enter, he is doubtless to be opposed by both Prince and people, as an Enemy not only to the Prince himself, but to the Commonwealth also in disturbing their peace and quiet: And being not yet seized of any such place of power as to make his acts or commands warrantable, there is nothing which is by him done in a politic capacity can be called lawful. But if the Tables be now turned, and he quietly seated in the Legis-

lative power, as the other was before, then are the Subjects to turn themselves in their obedience too, and having still respect to Gods ordinance and the publick quiet, continue on the same peace, by a dutiful submission to him that is now *Dei gratia* or by Divine providence brought into that authority, which the other did claim *Dei gratia* before: When yet the person thus entred, if he be not thoroughly satisfied in the right of his possession, stands before God accomprable for the injury done to the dispossessed, and what else shall happen in his regiment. In which respect, as his possession it self, so the commands thereby imposed, may well be unlawful as to the Imposer, but cannot be so esteemed in the Obeyer: He may be called Usurper by the dispossessed, in reference to the place by which he is impowered; but is not by the Subjects to be so thought in the execution of what is proper thereunto: They are to look to Possession as an evidence of Right in it self; for are not all mens Estates else called by that name? do we not say, Such and such men are men of great Possessions? And if Subjects shall be put to guide their obedience and loyalty by other dark evidences, who shall shew them and expound them but parties interess'd? and how shall they agree in them? Do we not, for peace sake, say in other things, that *Possession is eleven points of the Law*? And will it not in this much more follow, that it should be all twelve? There one part is left open and free, because Appeal to the Law-maker may make alteration: But there being in this case no Superior on earth, it is to pass as confirmed by God also, till he in his providence shall make alteration.

22. If this course should not hold, but their obedience and loyalty should not be lawful, if the Prince were not lawfully seised or made so by prescription, there would seldom any time happen, in any Nation amidst those many changes of Families, wherein Subjects could warrantably obey, for want thereof. It was not, I am sure, the practice and opinion of Christians formerly: They, as they lived
ne erer

neerer the Apostles times, so they followed more closely their precepts and examples, in subjection to the parties possessed of those higher powers they lived under. If they should have understood *S. Pauls* injunction of subjection to the *Powers that are*, to have no enforcement upon the conscience of any that could not be perswaded his present Prince or Emperor came in as a lawful Successor, or by lawful election; how could they have been at all times noted for such constant Loyalists, notwithstanding there were very few, but either in their entry balked the election and approbation of the Senate or people, which at first were held only lawful authorities, and as much afterwards transgressed the rule of hereditary succession, by bringing in new families. In which cases, although to the eyes of all men it was apparent, that force or craft set upon their present Sovereigns; yet would not they forget their duty of loyalty to him, however their Prince might have forgot to do justice to another. And if to this end we shall but look to our Stories, we shall find cause enough to retract this opinion of Disobedience, being contrary to the sense and practice of our loyal Ancestors. We will begin but from the Conquest, because best known, although more shifting have been before.

23. *Harold* that preceded the Conqueror, is chosen by the Nobility, being then the prevailing party; and though a stranger by family, is yet generally obeyed, notwithstanding the known right heir is amongst them, even *Edgar Atheling*.

24. *Harold* is thrust out by the Conqueror by force, both a stranger himself, and of a new family: He is also obeyed, notwithstanding the right heir is still living.

25. His son *William*, surnamed *Rufus*, dispossesseth his elder brother *Robert*, and is yet generally obeyed, although also the right heir be still living.

26. After him the other younger brother *Henry* possesseth the Crown, against the right of the said *Robert*, still living; and is yet generally obeyed.

27. Next, *Stephen*, by help of *Londoners* and Nobility, assumes the Crown; and although he were of a new family, yet is he generally obeyed, notwithstanding the right of succession was in *Maud* the Empress and her issue.

28. In the next, *Henry* the Second begins a new family, and in him indeed may we find the first true usurpation; for his own sons are taking upon them sovereign power, their father yet living and possessed.

29. He being dead, *Richard* the First his son gets the Throne, and is no longer to be called Usurper.

30. King *John* next seisseth on the Sovereignty against the hereditary right of his Brothers son. In his time indeed the Pope doth usurp authority to censure and depose.

31. The next Possessor is *Henry* the Third: who, although the son of the said *John*, is not yett call off upon the score of Usurpation, but generally acknowledged and obeyed. But he was much troubled with the usurped authorities of some of his Peers and Parliaments, who would often inroach upon the Sovereignty.

32. *Edward* the First is the next Possessor, generally obeyed, although entring upon the like claim, as Grandchild to King *John*.

33. To him succeeded his son *Edward* the Second, towards the end of whose time, Prescription of an hundred years from his Great-grandfather *John* might only have been pleaded to have made their obedience matter of conscience: when on the contrary he hath the most opposition of all his Predecessors, from his wife, Peers and Parliaments, all which usurp upon his authority.

34. *Edward* the Third the next, was not only a Rebel, but a true Usurper, in taking upon him to act in things of State, without and against his Fathers leave, being still in possession: For however his claim was undoubted as to succession, yet deserved he more then a stranger to have the odium of Usurpation cast upon him, as being most unnatural. Yet the Father being dead, and he possessed of the

the Crown, although the other had been forced to resign, (as he could not but well know) we do not find that any man took upon him to disobey him afterwards, as Rebel or Usurper.

35. This mans Successor, *Richard the Second*, we shall find deposed and dispossessed by a prevailing party, who set up *Henry the Fourth* as in right of the Family of *Lancaster*, reckoning the other but as Usurpers; whose Grandchild *Henry the First* is again dispossessed by that Family of *York* as Usurpers, whom they had called Usurpers before; and all within the space of sixty years. During which time, and that of *Richard the Second*, those that continued loyal to the persons in possession, were certainly to be esteemed better, and more conscientious Subjects than those that opposed; who could in truth be but Rebels.

36. Although the next, *Edward the Fourth*, might well be called Usurper, taking upon him as King, while the other was yet living, and in possession of part of the Country, and when also by the Articles made with his Father, and confirmed in Parliament, *Henry the Sixth* was to reign during his life, yet is he generally obeyed. But then, what shall we say of him, when his Predecessor *Henry the Sixth* comes to be restored and repossessed again; and himself being forced to fly beyond Sea, and after he was publickly proclaimed Usurper, entering the Land, durst not claim any right to the Crown, as his right, but onely to the Dukedom of *York* (wearing also the Badge of *Henry the Sixth's* eldest son in token of his Homage?) What shall we say, when he after in cruel manner smote him on the face with his Gantlet, and caused him to be slain by his own servants, and caused also the Father to whom he had formerly done homage to be imprisoned, murdered and scornfully buried; a person so good, that he was called by the name of the *Holy*? Yet do we not find but for all this, while he had possession, he had due loyalty and subjection acknowledged unto him, and;

27. Next, *Stephen*, by help of *Londoners* and Nobility, assumes the Crown; and although he were of a new family, yet is he generally obeyed, notwithstanding the right of succession was in *Maud* the Empress and her issue.

28. In the next, *Henry* the Second begins a new family, and in him indeed may we find the first true usurpation; for his own sons are taking upon them sovereign power, their father yet living and possessed.

29. He being dead, *Richard* the First his son gets the Throne, and is no longer to be called Usurper.

30. King *John* next seizes on the Sovereignty against the hereditary right of his Brothers son. In his time indeed the Pope doth usurp authority to censure and depose.

31. The next Possessor is *Henry* the Third: who, although the son of the said *John*, is not yett call'd off upon the score of Usurpation, but generally acknowledged and obeyed. But he was much troubled with the usurped authorities of some of his Peers and Parliaments, who would often inroach upon the Sovereignty.

32. *Edward* the First is the next Possessor, generally obeyed, although entering upon the like claim, as Grandchild to King *John*.

33. To him succeeded his son *Edward* the Second, towards the end of whose time, Prescription of an hundred years from his Great-grandfather *John* might only have been pleaded to have made their obedience matter of conscience: when on the contrary he hath the most opposition of all his Predecessors, from his wife, Peers and Parliaments, all which usurp upon his authority.

34. *Edward* the Third the next, was not only a Rebel, but a true Usurper, in taking upon him to act in things of State, without and against his Fathers leave, being still in possession: For however his claim was undoubted as to succession, yet deserved he more than a stranger to have the odium of Usurpation cast upon him, as being most unnatural. Yet the Father being dead, and he possessed of the

the Crown, although the other had been forced to resign, (as he could not but well know) we do not find that any man took upon him to disobey him afterwards, as Rebel or Usurper.

35. This mans Successor, *Richard the Second*, we shall find deposed and dispossessed by a prevailing party, who set up *Henry the Fourth* as in right of the Family of *Lancaster*, reckoning the other but as Usurpers; whose Grandchild *Henry the First* is again dispossessed by that Family of *York* as Usurpers, whom they had called Usurpers before; and all within the space of sixty years. During which time, and that of *Richard the Second*, those that continued loyal to the persons in possession, were certainly to be esteemed better, and more conscientious Subjects than those that opposed; who could in truth be but Rebels.

36. Although the next, *Edward the Fourth*, might well be called Usurper, taking upon him as King, while the other was yet living, and in possession of part of the Country, and when also by the Articles made with his Father, and confirmed in Parliament, *Henry the Sixth* was to reign during his life, yet is he generally obeyed. But then, what shall we say of him, when his Predecessor *Henry the Sixth* comes to be restored and repossessed again; and himself being forced to fly beyond Sea, and after he was publicly proclaimed Usurper, entering the Land, durst not claim any right to the Crown, as his right, but onely to the Dukedom of *York* (wearing also the Badge of *Henry the Sixth's* eldest son in token of his Homage?) What shall we say, when he after in cruel manner smote him on the face with his Gantlet, and caused him to be slain by his own servants, and caused also the Father to whom he had formerly done homage to be imprisoned, murdered and scornfully buried; a person so good, that he was called by the name of the *Holy*? Yet do we not find but for all this, while he had possession, he had due loyalty and subjection acknowledged unto him,

and:

and the Crown entailed on his Family.

73. Against the Right of his Son *Edward the Fifth*, King *Richard the Third* enters, and might well also be called Usurper, because he exercised Kingly power before the other was actually dispossessed. And yet, as ill as he was otherwise also, is he generally obeyed and fought for.

83. *Henry the Seventh* succeeds; but he, not taking to himself Kingly power till he were in full possession, is not called Usurper: Although his title was not so good as the others, (whom we are however to expect to be called Usurper and Tyrant also, the more to dignifie the other now in possession) when as yet, although the said *Richard* were an Usurper as to his Nephews, he was none to him. Again, although *Richard* were dead, yet were there others living, and in *England* too, of a far more lineal and legal claim to the Crown, as was the Lady *Elizabeth*, Daughter to *Edward the Fourth*, and the Earl of *Warwick*, Son to the elder Brother of King *Richard*, *George Duke of Clarence*, to whom and his Heirs the Crown was also by Parliament given by *Henry the Sixth*, in case he should die without issue, as he did. And yet further, he stood by Act of Parliament attainted of Treason, and had his Lands and Goods with those of his followers confiscate to the said King *Richard*: May he not also be called Usurper, for that he not onely exercised Kingly power before he was married to the Lady *Elizabeth*, the right Heir, but that afterwards he never so much as joyned her name in Acts of State and Sovereignty; when by the Law of the Land she should have been chief, as was adjudged on the case of *Queen Mary* and King *Philip*. And although he also brings in a new Family, to wit that of *Tudor* in place of *Plantagenet*; yet, being in possession of the Crown, he hath not the stile of Usurpation so thrown upon him, as to take off the Subjects duty of allegiance. Nor do I think that any will commend them for Loyalty, that did after rise in the behalf of

Perkin

Perkin Warbeck; although the Subjects generally thought him to be the right Heir indeed, and no counterfeit.

39. *Henry the Eighth* succeeds him upon the same Title, and *Edward the Sixth* him, with very small dispute of their Right.

40. *Queen Mary* finds another Claimer to retard her possession; namely the Lady *Jane Grey*. And truly had she not bestirred herself, and frightened the other party by a much greater power, I believe the other would, with her possession, have been generally reputed and obeyed as the legal Heir, having all the State confirmation could be then expected. For the Lords of the Council, that then acted all publick affairs, caused her to be proclaimed in London; and no worse a man then 'B Ridley, in a Sermon at Pauls Cross, perswaded obedience to Lady *Jane*, and invighed earnestly against the Title of Lady *Mary*, as witnesseth *Stow*, fol. 1033. And it is like he might use the same motives against the succession of her, as are recorded by *Mr. Camden* (in his introduction to the Annals of *Queen Elizabeth*, to have been used against the succession of her and her Sister also.) To wit, for that the Ladies *Mary* and *Elizabeth* were by the Act of Parliament judged illegitimate, which Act was never duly repealed (notwithstanding that the King their Father had by the same Act declared, that they should succeed in order after *Edward the Sixth*, if his issue should fail:) and for that the said Sisters could not by the Common Law of England be Successors Hereditarily to King *Edward*, because they were not Germans, that is, of the whole blood by Father and Mother, but (as our Lawyers term it) of the half blood, It was also signified that *Henry the Eighth* by his last Will and Testament, conveyed the title of the Crown to the said Lady *Jane*, *Mary*, or the Lady *Elizabeth* should marry with Foreign Princes, which might revoke the Bishop of Romes Authority now banished out of England, and subject the English under a foreign yoke. And to the same purpose also were
pro-

produced Letters Pattents of King Edward the Sixth, made a little before his death, and signed with the hands of many Noblemen, Bishops, Judges, and others. But all this notwithstanding, those very Lords that had before caused her to be proclaimed, finding afterwards themselves unable to put her into full possession, they wisely laid Title aside; proclaimed the other, and made what haste they could to obtain her favour: Dutifully and wisely preferring that which was the sure way to publick peace and benefit (although hazardous and disadvantageous to their own) before a more sure way to their own advance, with the loss of that which was publick.

41. What shall we now think of the lawfulness of all those transactions, which, all along, in those times were performed to the several Princes here? was there never any obedience rightly given but to *Edward the Second*, and *Queen Elizabeth*, because they two onely could prescribe as to the term of a Hundred years since the Crown was usurped by their Progenitors, and this hapening to them but towards the end of their Reigns, shall we conclude that what was done before, or towards any other, was not legally done, and to be esteemed acts of fear and flattery more then of Duty? How comes it to pass that the Laws made by these several Princes, nay by *Richard the Third* himself, are acknowledged for Laws of force? If possession of the Law-makers place gave them a right to make laws, will it not also give them a right to their Subjects obedience? Beyond all which if we will be truly regarding the injury offered to the deposed Family, and think our selves obliged to see right therein done (without regard to the publick) will it not follow, that this injury being the higher, and the more as the party doing it was nearer in relation, or of kin to those he did it, that therefore an Usurpation made by a stranger, is not so heinous, as where a Son usurpeth against his Fathers liking, as *Edward the Third* did; or an Uncle against Nephews, as King *John*, and *Richard the Third*, or one Brother

ther against another, or the like, as is to be observed in this long story. In which cases to alleadge they had consent of the people, this will not make any thing lawful as to their taking of possession, more then it did that of *Adoniah* against the liking of *David*.

42 Find we any in all this List of Kings, and story of changings amongst them that left his stile and claim of *Dei gratia* or divine providence, and stood upon that of lawful succession; when they do still all along write themselves *Henry, Edward*, or the like, *By the Grace of God King of England, &c.* not mentioning at all their Fathers or Progenitors name, or the descent by which they did at first claim: What is this (I say) but plainly to evidence to us, that the best evidence of their right and tenure, as Gods Vicegerents, is that attestation of his Providence, whereby they have been enabled to attain this possession: Towards the Attainment of which, the same providence doth ordinarily make use of succession, until he hath some notable work to do; and then, sometimes of election, by *bowing the hearts of the people*, and sometimes of conquest, as *Lord of Hosts*. Yet can I never find that however those that were to enter, for strengthening of their party and adherents, were ready to make use of popular exclamations against Usurpers, and to do their best to have it beleaved, that the possessor was so, yet (as I said) they, being in possession, stuck to that claim above all other. A fresh example hereof we have in her that was Successor to *Queen Mary*, and the last of the Family of the *Tuedors*, or indeed; of the English Nation that were Crowned amongst us. For says Mr. *Camden* in his *Annals* of *Queen Elizabeth*, fol. 18. *Although in some mens opinions Bacons wisdom failed him (on whom as an Oracle of the Law the Queen wholly relied in such matters) for that the Act of Parliament which had excluded her, and Queen Mary from succession of the Crown was not repealed; upon which, some seditious persons took occasion afterwards to attempt dangerous matters against her, as being*

not lawful Queen, yet (saith he) the English Laws having long since pronounced, That the Crown once worne quite taketh away all defect whatsoever. It was by others imputed to Bacon's wisdom, who in so great perplexity and inconstancie of Acts and Statutes, whereas those things that made for Queen Elizabeth, seemed to be joined with the ignominy and disgrace of Queen Mary, would not new-gall the sore which was with age skinned over; and therefore applied himself unto that Act of the 35. year of Henry the Eighth, which in a manner provided for both their fames and dignities alike.

43. So that we find, that however Princes are, in prudence, willing to omit no claim that may make for their admission or security, and that especially at their first entrance; yet is seisure and possession held ever to be the steadiest support; nay, such it is in the expresse verdict of Law it self. To which end I shall here insert the opinion of him that (by Lawyers themselves) hath been accounted the Oracle of the Law since, in fuller confirmation of that Maxim before set down: And that is the resolution of my Lord Coke, who, in the third Book of his *Institutes*, f. 7. 8. in the Title of *Treason*, expounding the words of *N're Seignior le Roy*, says, that by *le Roy* is to be understood a King regnant, and not of one that hath but the name of a King. And then also he alleadges the instance of Queen Mary, on whom, as having indeed the sovereign power, the word *le Roy* was appropriate, although she were a woman, and her husband at the same time stiled King of England. And that the stile or title alters not the respect and obedience due from Subjects to Sovereigns, more then it doth from Children to the Master or Father, (in which respect a Yeoman is as absolute in his relation as a Lord) may appear (besides) in that instance of our Kings holding the sovereignty of Ireland under the title of Lords, and not as Kings, till of late times; during which space they had certainly as great authority as afterwards, and the Subjects there were in the same cases made Rebels or Traitors

Traitors to him as Lord, as afterwards to him as King. Afterward he quotes in the margent, the Statute of 11 H. 7. enacting, *That none shall be condemned for any thing done in obedience to the present King or Sovereign,* (for so the words of the Statute are, *King or Sovereign*) He further saith, *This Act is to be understood of a King in possession of the Crown and Kingdom; for if there be a King regnant in possession, although he be Rex de facto, & non de jure, yet is he Seigneur le Roy within the purview of this Statute; and the other that hath right, and is out of possession, is not within this Act: Nay, if Treason be committed against a King de facto, & non de jure, and after the King de jure cometh to the Crown, he shall punish the Treason done to the King de facto; and a Pardon granted by a King de jure, that is not also de facto, is void.* By all which it will appear, that the Law directs our fidelity to N^re Seigneur, our Sovereign Lord, not confining it to the stile of *le Roy* or King, to whom it is only due as being actually N^re Roy, our Sovereign Lord the King.

44. By which we may see, that the intention of Common and Fundamental Law of the Land was not, by proper Acts made at the instance of, and in favor to particular persons and their families, to overthrow that first main design of Publike peace, which was sought by appointment of a Successor in the Government. The which because it was to be supposed to come to the Heir of the Possessor, therefore were Subjects sworn to Him, his Heirs and Successors; still intending that it is not due to the Heir only as Heir, if he be not also Successor. For if so, why did not the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacie run as Grants of Land, and of other inferior Offices of Power, *To him and his Heirs*, if none but his true Heir must be obeyed after his death or removal? And therefore the Law, by putting down that word of *Successor*, did (doubtless) determine, that obedience should go along with possession, as before noted.

45. The Laws, you see, having publick regard, will not

be abused with these misapplied terms of Usurper, or the like, which passion or interest (as heretofore noted) had politickly sometimes wrested to serve as a snare to withdraw obedience from the person already in power, when it was only due to him that did attempt to dispossess him. And therefore they use not the term of Usurper more in this then other cases, where he that takes possession of any thing by fraud or force, is not called Usurper, but Disseisor, or the like; even as here he is called a King by fact. They knew well enough how to put a difference between the legality of their commands that are Usurpers, while they were usurping; and theirs that are now Possessors, although they were once Usurpers. While they are in their act of usurpation, they are to be resisted not only as opposers of publick quiet, but of the Crown and dignity of the present Prince, which, in conscience as well as by oath, we are bound to maintain. But then, if it happen that the Crown and dignity do by providence fall to him that was Usurper before, the same consideration of duty and publick peace must enjoin us to loyalty where the Crown and dignity is; all actors to his disturbance must be now resisted as Usurpers. For as the Oath of Allegiance did personally before pass in relation to that Regal power he or his had, or were like to have; so when the person or family comes to be changed, it must be presumed to pass in reason to those that shall be now possessed of those Regal powers to which it is due.

46. But because some Divines may perhaps make slight of the determination of Lawyers in this matter, I shall confirm their judgment out of plain example in Scripture. What think we of that punishment which *David* the King over Israel *de jure*, did inflict on *Baana* and *Rechab* for their Treason against *Ishbosheth*, that was but King *de facto*? Nay, what think we of the doing it by this King *de jure*, before he was possessed of that Crown? Again, what other plea but Possession can justify all those of *Israel* for adhering to him, since the right was in *David* to.

to rule over *Israel* as well as *Judah*? To think that they knew not that *David* was by God appointed Ruler over *Israel*, as well as *Abigail*, 1 Sam. 15. 30. hath little likelihood; nay, it is plain that *Abner* knew so much, by those words of his, *God do so to Abner, and more also, except as the Lord hath sworn to David, even so I do to him. To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan to Beersheba*, 2 Sam. 3. 9, 10. Nay, that all *Israel* knew so much, appears by their speech to *David*, after that *Ishbosheth*, *Saul's* son, was dead, viz. *In time past when Saul was King over us, thou wast he that leddest out and broughtest in Israel; and the Lord said to thee, Thou shalt feed my people Israel, and thou shalt be a Captain over my people Israel.* They make no Apologie for their past obedience to another set up over them by the power of *Abner*, without any choice of theirs, as may be presumed: And yet being a King and possessed, *David* is so far from blaming his Subjects for obedience, that he calls him a *Righteous person*, 2 Sam. 4. 11. that is to say, one that by reason of possession ought to be esteemed righteous by such as, like *Baana* and *Rechab*, lived under him. Nay, if possession give not to Princes right to command their Subjects also, I see not how *David*, in that seven years war between the house of *Saul* and his, 2 Sam. 3. 1. could be excused of that oath he made to him of *not cutting off his seed after him*, 1 Sam. 24. 21, 22. For however the war be there set down as between the two houses, yet it being to be looked upon as a National contest, it became not *David*, now in publick charge, to prefer his private engagement before that engagement he now had taken upon him, that is, to preserve the common safety and liberty of his Subjects against all opposers, however they might be well esteemed of by himself. And the truth is, that however all Kings are pressing that an Oath of Allegiance, or the like should be express to them and their family; yet since the whole reason for swearing to them and their family, and in maintenance of their power, was
in.

in reference to peace and publick good to be preserved by their power, it must of consequence follow, that being out of power, that then the obligation of the Oath doth attend him on whom the power now rests for preserving that publick peace and good.

47. And indeed if he should be an Usurper in any Monarchy, which could not prove his descent by direct lineal right from an Ancestor by God put in, or instituted by Nature, then all the Monarchs that are or have been in the world, except some few that by express divine appointment have ruled amongst the Jews, are and have been Usurpers, or at least for ought appears to the contrary; even for that they cannot, or do not derive their pedigree from Adam, in such sort as to evince, that of all that Nation wherein they live and govern, both their family, and they in it, ought by the rule of *Primogeniture* to have precedence to that Sovereignty; according to the observation of the judicious Author of a Treatise called, *The Anarchy of a limited Monarchy*, who says, f. 12. *All Kings that now are, or ever were, are, or were either Fathers of their people, or the Heirs of such Fathers, or Usurpers of the right of such Fathers. It is a truth undeniable, that there cannot be any multitude of men whatsoever, either great or small, though gathered together from the several corners and remotest regions of the world, but that in the same multitude considered by it self, there is one man amongst them that in nature hath a right to be the King of all the rest, as being the next heir to Adam, and all the others subject unto him. Every man by nature is a King or a Subject; the obedience which all Subjects yield to Kings, is but the paying of that duty which is due to the supreme Fatherhood. Many times by the act either of an Usurper himself, or of those that set him; Heir of a Crown is dispossessed, God using the wickedest men for the removing and setting up; in such cases the Subjects obedience to the Father must go along and wait upon Gods providence, w right to give and take away Kingdoms, and thereby to adopt Subjects*

Subjects in the obedience of another Fatherly Power. In which as he hath in the beginning, according to the most general opinion of the Royalist, founded Monarchy on Patriarchical Right, so doth he end like a true Royalist indeed, in directing Subjects obedience to wait on *Gods providence in the appointment of this their political Father*, in like manner as they do of their natural. For since right of Primogeniture and power of Government, could not be conceived to be given to *Cain* out of personal worth, but for preservation of peace; and since no one now, as *David* formerly, can plead divine Right for the settlement of their Families, therefore it must still follow, that all Families being equal as to original right; respect to peace and obedience must in conscience cause us to submit to that Person or Family which *Divine Providence* hath set over us.

48. Nay and respect to the continual administration of Justice also, unto which (doubtless) our Laws had an especial regard, when not onely the publick peace is called the *Kings Peace*, but the Laws too are called his Laws, being acted in his name, as well as enforced by his authority; so that to question or abolish his power of Judicature, is not onely to overthrow Peace but Justice also. In-
somuch as if none should be at any time so lawfully possessed of the sovereign power, as to challenge obedience, no man then can expect a legal remedy for any injury offered him by another; for how can he do me right upon my appeal, if he may not lawfully command, and the other be not bound to obedience? And if another be bound, why not I? Would I be righted in my own particular by acknowledgement of his authority, and do I yet think it hard to joyn with all others in the like acknowledgement whereby the whole Commonwealth may have right? Doth not protection necessarily imply and call for subjection as perfect relatives? If I hold Land of another, either by rent or service, or both, and do in that case think

it reasonable in me to expect continuance of that benefit which ariseth by tenancy ; am I not bound to give to him of whom I hold and have it, that rent and homage which is due to the place he holdeth ? And would I not (being a Lord) expect the like from my Tenants ? Would I think it proper or reasonable, that upon any of my Tenants presumption, that I was not so rightly seized as they conceived I should, they might thereupon take liberty to withdraw their acknowledgments and services, even during the time they hold under me ? If this were permitted, and some of the Tenants licenced to withhold their Lords due upon every fair pretence they could make that way, what great disturbance, do we think, would insue ? Doth not the instance between *Nabal* and *David* inform us, that the rule of Reason and Prudence, as well as Gratitude do justly call for obedience, and compliance to a protecting power, even in a case against the interest and leave of his present Prince, and while he is neither possessed, nor so much as claiming the whole Sovereignty, and shall we think it yet reasonable that after this Sovereign power is wholly possessed ; and hath been generally submitted unto, we may then with *Shemei* or *Sheba*, out of particular love or relation to the last person or family, as being allied by courtesie or kindred ; or out of some discontent at this, renounce and cast off our subjection when we shall think fit ?

47. Surely no ; such a resolution can never find entertainment in any that is a true Cavalier indeed ; that is, one that out of a true sence of duty and loyalty alone appeared on the side of the late King, even because he was their King, and their present Governour in chief. I am (for my part) perswaded, that as the most considerable body of that party consisted of the Nobility and Gentry, so were they men of too much honour and ingenuity to joyn themselves that way in hope of any private advantage to themselves ; but rather resolved to hazard their own lives and fortunes in testimony of their loyalty to their present Sovereign.

reign. And therefore I have cause to hope that no loss by that means to be sustained (which the chance of war must render to one side or other) can move them to be now so inconsiderately inconstant, as to cease to be loyal at such a time as is apparently advantageous also. All sinister construction and wresting of principles is most to be feared from such as appeared on that party, not out of any such consciencious principle to their King, as King, but as they stood byassed by hope of gain or preferment; such as these, finding themselves defeated of their aims, it is no wonder if they be found hardly reconcileable to those they conceive the Authors thereof, but mutinous against them; without any just sence of that publick detriment which must thence insue. It being not unlikely also, but that, in case the King had prevailed, those that were then the most forward in lifting themselves for the Royal party, would themselves have proved the Kings greatest enemies, if their covetousness or ambition stood at any time not satisfied to their liking: no otherwise then we do plainly find now, in some of those that were most zealous on the other side, as if they were the most godly of that party; who upon such like discontent, are found most ready to turn enemies themselves to that party and protection under which they fought; clearly evincing, that it was rather *gain* then *godliness*, that first engaged them. It was for the confusion of these, and such as these, and for prevention of such dangerous doctrines and practises as they might infuse into others, to the abatement of our bounden duty, on the one hand, and the endangering our just punishment on the other, that hath made me thus large in the discovery of all those things as they stand both in conscience and prudence considerable in themselves, separate from all personal regard and prejudice.

48. For if we be not very watchful against such like insinuations, or what our own passions and prejudices may in these cases tempt us unto, we may quickly mistake in

our respect and censures of Gods Vicegerent amongst us, no otherwise then *St. Paul* did in his answer to the High Priest, at such a time as he stood much exasperated through sence of his present suffering under his command. But what then? if he fall, mark how quickly he riseth? If he be told by a Brother that it was *Gods High-Priest*, he *so answered*, he disputes not his succession or legal election into that Office according to their former law; although he could not but know, that these were wanting in a far higher measure then can be now objected. But he being now in *Moses seat*, the Seat of supreme aurtority, applies the Text of subjection and respect to him, *Thou shalt not curse the Gods, nor revile the Rulers of the people*: As if on purpose to leave us a president, that no such supposition could hereafter warrant any mans disobedience or contempt of Authority. It will therefore concern us to be very watchful against all temptations of like kind, as that which is but too subject to prevail upon flesh and blood. For however such things may have a religious appearance put upon them by him that can transform himself into an *Angel of light*, yet by their fruits we may know them to be none other then works of flesh.

49. When therefore we read that this blessed Apostle, and true Saint indeed, *Saint Paul* himself is finding a law in his members warring against the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity unto the law of sin. Shall we, such as we, think we are free? have we not rather just cause to doubt, that since he, notwithstanding that abundant grace and revelation given him, could not at all times discover and bear against this enmity, even against this sinister construction, which particular interest is ready to put in, for interruption or misleading him when he came to interpret or practise what was by God commanded him in the law; so much more we, on whom the ends of the world are come, may well suspect and fear that our natural corruption will take place, even in our
most

most religious performances ; and that sin which was before natural onely, *taking occasion by the Commandment*, to insinuate it self under a religious form will be subject to *deceive, and (thereby) slay us.*

50. But what need a doubt be made of our readiness to confess the prevalence of this our original state of corruption? Do we not find it on all hands acknowledged? Nay more, do we not find each one as for himself, ready to confess his own imbecilities in performance of most holy things? as in a general way we do; when yet again, it is as sure, that when, in such or such particular actions or opinions, we come to raise a foundation for our deportments, or belief, we shall then be found so precipitately and hastily swayed, as not onely to give a partial ear to the temptations offered by this Law; but also, for the most part to be carried with such violence, as not at all to search or doubt whether prejudice, interest, or other natural corruption be therewith mingled or no. When we find in how many particulars that which had been *said of old time* in the law, was by partial construction of such as lived under it, made to serve private interest and revenge (where publick good and justice was intended) we are all of us ready enough to believe that mis-interpretation did sure enough happen to them; when yet in our interpretation of some Gospel Rules and Precepts, we suffer our selves to be as prejudicately led, without either due consideration of publick good or benefit at all, or else measure and apply it in relation to our separate credits or benefit. We would sooner believe that such as *Elijah* or *Elishah* should transcend their Relations, and intrude into the Governors employment of distributing equal Justice, by that Rule, of *an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth*; Nay, and our Saviours own Disciples therein follow them too, then that we, we who can now boast so much of our Evangelical light, should in any acts of ours shew our selves any way guilty of such

mistaken zeal, no, not we. Those things belong to our Enemies, those of the contrary opinion, or party to us; they, not we, bring railing accusations, despise Dominion, and speak evil of Dignities, have onely a forme of godliness, profess they know God but in works they deny him, being abominable and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate. But let us be wary of the Stragems of the old Serpent, of that subtilty wherewith he beguiled Eve, to transgress a known command, under a fair pretence of being more like God, or God-like; We must not do evil that good may come of it. Where God hath expressly, and without exception, commanded obedience to the higher power, or to love one another, he that breaks that precept, or hates his Brother, is neither truly godly, nor a lover of God. Meekness, Humility, Patience, &c. are the Gospel rules. Religion, if it be pure, will be peaceable: But if it be contentious, it proceeds from pride. Let us therefore (I say) be very careful to examine our own hearts, as that which is desperately wicked, and deceitfull above all things. Let us lay righteousness to the line: do we not break a plain precept, when we disobey or reproach our Governours, or persecute or censure our Brother? And then, are we, on the other side, as sure that the cause why we do it, is indeed the Cause of God, and so nearly concerning him that it must be now, and by us done; and that without further warrant, or else his honour will be lost? That we transgress by our disobedience, every one sees; but that we are right in our reason for doing it, none sees but our selves. I am perswaded that if the frame of our hearts were well searched, that even in our most zealous and religious ways of acting to the disturbance of others, or disobedience to Authority, it would be often found, that it was not true piety, but pride that caused contention; and stubbornness, and discontent to be in subjection to any other, was the true

true cause we became so extremely devoted to the service of God, that, under colour of some service and obedience to a higher Power, our contempt of this might be justified. To try whether this were so or no, let us strictly and impartially examine our own aims in the search of Scripture in things wherein obedience and submission is expected.

Do we indeed search them with a meek, patient, and unprejudiced spirit; with a true desire to be farther satisfied in our submission and conformity, as that which hath apparently in it self directest tendency to Gods glory, and mans good? Or do we not rather search both them and the Law, with hearts full of anger and discontent, and a desire to find things clean otherwise, even to find some exception how we may resist the higher power, or meddle with those that are given to change? Why then, it is a sure sign that there is a root of bitterness springing up, we shall therewith be defiled. If the evil spirit find the house thus swept and garnished, find such a preparedness to evil, we shall return but ten times more the children of wrath then before. As we see of Balaam, that notwithstanding a plain Precept, *Go not wish them*, Numb. 22. 2. would yet, from a corrupt principle within, be further searching what Gods mind was: Why then, being given over to strong delusions, he found an answer, *Go wish them*; So when we shall abuse those plain precepts given in the Scripture, as in order to publick good, and will be seeking among mystical Texts for other contrary rules, whereby to guide our selves, will it not then be just with God to let us hear (as he did) *an answer in the night*, saying, *Go wish them*, vers. 20? But however we should mistake our own hearts, through the deceitfulness of sin, yet if we find men to be so far progressive in the course of disobedience and gain-saying, as to persist therein, even after that the Reformation contended for, and all that could be reasonably expected, is now brought about, and that

against.

against those too that were their Leaders, and did accompany them therein, this will plainly evince to the world that they began upon a carnal principle, let their pretensions be as godly as they will; And I fear many now living are too plainly guilty herein. And amongst these that thus see visions *in the night*: What think we of them that dream of a Fifth Monarchy? Who since they can find neither Government nor Governour better on earth, will seek one in heaven; Christ himself shall rule them, or they will not be ruled at all. Why truly, when he comes to reign personally, which ought to be every good mans prayer, I beleieve no Christian will be found unwilling to submit to his Scepter, and in the mean time, I hope none will refuse to submit to that Authority, which amongst us doth most represent him.

FINIS.

The READER is desired to mend these ERRATA.

P Ag. 6. l. 2. *Oeconomical*. l. 34 insert this word [*and*] before *and* to believe. *Gr.* p. 18. l. 8. r. *acknowledg.* p. 22. l. 12. r. *dash* for *where*. p. 23. l. 12. *eff* *sted* for *expelled*. p. 40. l. 9. *dele* Job 56. 8. p. 44. l. 31. r. *cleve* for *there*. p. 51. l. 10. *d ride* for *divide*. p. 58. l. 5. *were* for *now*. l. 12. *worth* for *work*. l. 15. *now*: for *now*. p. 62. l. 23. r. *given* 10. p. 77. l. 15. *dele* only. p. 82. l. 16. r. *defect*. p. 87. l. 2. r. *imitation*. l. 9. *dele* *In these*. l. 25. *dele* *yes*. p. 92. l. 18. r. *is it* for *it is*. l. 19. r. *like*? for *like*; l. 29 *dele* *possessed*. p. 93. l. 7. *dele* *it*. p. 97. l. ult. r. *an equal*. p. 103. l. 15. r. *and* for *I*. p. 104. l. 4. r. *so* for *be*. l. 17. r. *In case* for *in case*. p. 105. l. 26. r. *and* for *are*. l. 28. r. *defeat*. l. 31. r. *repeal*. p. 106. l. 8. *dele* *when*. p. 109. l. 2. r. *express*. p. 112. l. 22 r. *disengage* for *distinguish*. p. 113. l. 15. r. *up* for *uray*. p. 117. l. 12. r. *confirmation*. & l. 33. read, *Lady Jane Grey*; and *wit* *hal* *it* was shewed how dangerous a matter it might be if the Lady.

